MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW

5 MARCH 1982

Israel

France will seek to ensure that Israel's right to exist is universally and unambiguously recognized, President Francois Mitterrand told the Knesset in a speech carried by Paris radio. But he also emphasized that the Palestinians have the right to exist and must decide their own fate on condition they set their rights in the context of respect for the rights of others and use dialogue instead of violence. The PLO, which represents the Palestinian fighters, cannot hope to negotiate so long as it denies Israel's right to exist, but dialogue implies that each party will realize its rights, and for the Palestinians, this may mean a state at the appropriate time, Mitterrand continued. Borders and other conditions should be decided by the negotiators alone, not outside parties, and everything should be negotiable, he maintained.

In a Knesset speech in honor of Mitterrand, carried by Jerusalem radio, Prime Minister Begin called Mitterrand a friend of Israel and said that he will revive the friendship and perhaps even alliance between Israel and France. Begin also said, however, that the main obstacle to such a path is French support for a Palestinian state in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza.

Opposing the view that the "so-called PLO" is the sole legitimate representative of the Arabs who live in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza, Begin described the Palestine National Council Charter as the Arab edition of "Mein Kampf." According to Begin, Fatah Central Committee member Hani al-Hasan told DAVAR's London correspondent a few days ago that the PLO will not be content with a state in the West Bank and Gaza, but will strive to bring about a single Palestine. Al-Hasan reportedly maintained that Zionism is the Devil, the PLO does not negotiate with it and the Zionist entity will not survive for long.

After praising the autonomy plan, Begin outlined the dangers a PLO-ruled state would pose to Israel's existence and denied that either symmetry or justice required establishing a 22d Arab state.

Toward the end of his speech Begin proposed that all Mediterranean states sign a joint charter pledging that no nation will initiate war, that any conflict will be resolved through negotiations and that war will not serve as a political tool, and requested Mitterrand to take the initiative in promoting such a document.

At a joint news conference, reported by Jerusalem radio, Mitterrand said Begin's arguments have not led him to change the views he expressed to the Knesset.

Begin and Mitterrand discussed the situation in Lebanon at a 4 March luncheon reported by IDF radio. Begin pointed to the Syrian "conquest" of Lebanon and the exposed Christian minority, and explained why Israel is assisting it with arms. He expressed the hope that the cease-fire on the Lebanese border will continue forever, but according to Jerusalem radio he emphasized that if the terrorists in Lebanon violate the cease-fire, Israel will eliminate them. Begin also proposed continuous French-Israeli links to discuss any threat to the Lebanese Christians from either Syria or the PLO.

At a meeting with Alignment representatives, reported by Jerusalem radio, Mitterrand said it is unthinkable that a million people should live under foreign rule. They need a country, an identity, he emphasized.

Four West Bank mayors met with French External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson and handed him a memorandum on the Palestine problem, Jerusalem radio reported. The document demands that France reject the Camp David accords, regards French MFO participation as a slap at the Palestinians, proclaims the PLO as the Palestinians' sole representative, and seeks French aid in stopping Israeli actions in the territories.

Egypt

Support for Mitterrand -- Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Butrus Ghali welcomed French President Francois Mitterrand's remarks to the Knesset concerning a Palestinian state, MENA reported. Ghali hoped this would encourage Europe to play a positive role that could give impetus to the process of establishing a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

Autonomy Committee -- The tripartite working committee on the Palestinian autonomy negotiations concluded its latest round of meetings in Cairo, according to MENA. During the talks, Egypt rejected Israel's view on the security question, MENA noted, affirming that security should be for all parties, including the Palestinians, and not for Israel alone.

Lebanon - PLO

Haddad Warning -- Christian militia leader Maj Sa'd Haddad warned that he will use force if necessary to prevent UNIFIL deploying its reinforcements in the sector between Beaufort Castle and Marj 'Uyun, Jerusalem radio reported. If UNIFIL troops are stationed there, Haddad said, the terrorists will be encouraged to renew firing because it will be harder for Israel to attack them.

Khalaf Speech -- In a speech to a Beirut rally broadcast by the clandestine Voice of Palestine radio, Fatah Central Committee member Salah Khalaf deplored the recent spate of car bomb explosions in Lebanon which, he claimed, were financed by the Deuxieme Bureau, Bashir al-Jumayyil and Israel. Asserting that the Palestinians are likewise capable of planting bombs in east Beirut but have not yet done so for humanitarian reasons, Khalaf warned that if the bombings do not cease, explosions will go off everywhere. He also deplored tempering in the Lebanese arena by unspecified Arab intelligence services, accusing them of the recent attempt to blow up Zahir al-Khatib's radio station.

Khalaf also criticized Arab rulers who are preparing Egypt's return to the Arab fold and who think their money can buy the souls, speech and silence of the Palestinians. After warning the Egyptians against executing Khalid Islamabuli, Khalaf said the PLO cannot accept the return of Egypt to the Arab fold tied to the peace treaty and the Camp David accords.

Gulf Affairs

A Qatari Government statement broadcast by Doha radio strongly protested Bahrain's actions in naming a new warship the Hawar, which is the name of Qatari-owned islands claimed by Bahrain, and in staging live ammunition naval exercises in waters whose ownership is disputed by Qatar and Bahrain. Asserting that Bahrain has for a long time acted provocatively and aggressively in the dispute over the Hawar Islands and the median line between the Qatari and Bahraini continental shelves, the statement warned that Qatar holds Bahrain responsible for the results of its actions.

Iran

Referring to a U.S. State Department official's announcement that the United States is ready to hold talks with Iran and protect its territorial integrity, the political director general of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs told Tehran radio that the United States has embarked on a new series of plots designed to stigmatize Iran and save "disgraced" Iraqi President Saddam Husayn. Iran needs no assistance from any superpower to safeguard its territorial integrity, the official said, and will hold no such talks with the U.S. Government.

FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Middle East and Africa

Vol V No 044 *5 March 1982*

MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW 1

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

'Arafat: U.S. Aid Major Obstacle to PLO Cause [Rome L'ESPRESSO 28 Feb] A 1
Khalaf Warns Lebanese Opposition Against Attacks [VOP] A 3
Qaddumi Comments on Mitterrand Remarks in Israel [VOP] A 5
Chedli Klibi Remarks [Tunis] A 5
Fatah Member Wants Mubarak To Change Course [VOP] A 6
'Arafat Receives Kuwaiti Envoy, Lebanese Deputy [VOP] A 6
DFLP Leader: Fedayeen Action Will Escalate [Kuwait AL-WATAN 28 Feb] A 7
Islamic Conference Official on Iraq-Iran Conflict [Riyadh AR-RIYAD 2 Mar] A 9

ARABIAN PENINSULA

BAHRAIN

Government Denies Exiles' Report on Deaths [AFP] C 1
Tunisian Prime Minister Arrives for Talks C 1
Meets With Amir C 1
Tunisian Minister on Mzali's Tour, Gulf War C 1
Kuwaiti Military Official Departs 4 March C 2

KUWAIT

Chief of Staff on Gulf Military Industry Plans [Riyadh AL-JAZIRAH 1 Mar] C 2
Publication of AL-MUJATAMA' Suspended 2 Weeks [QNA] C 3

OMAN

Malaysian Prime Minister Holds Official Talks C 3

QATAR

Bahrain's Conduct on Disputed Areas Protested C 4

SAUDI ARABIA

Al-Qadhdhafi Deplored for 'Malacious Attacks' C 5
Radio Commentary C 5
UAE President Zayid Arrives in Riyadh 4 Mar C 6

UAE

Iran's 'Azizi Meets Deputy Prime Minister C 6

EGYPT

Muhyi ad-Din Reviews Peace Policy With EEC Group D 1
European Delegation Departs D 1
Autonomy Technical Teams Conclude Meetings D 1
Israeli Delegation Departs D 2
Ghali Comments on Mitterrand Knesset Speech D 2
More Ghali Comments D 2
Prime Minister Holds Talks With DPRK Official D 2
'Ali Receives Vice Premier D 2
'Ali Hosts Banquet D 3
Mubarak Cables Rawlings on Independence Day D 3
Cairo Weekly Notes Return of Arab Federations D 3
[AL-AHRAR 1 Mar]
Mubarak Urges 'Return to Spirit of Islam' D 4
[London ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT 4 Mar]
Trial of Defense Lawyer Delayed After Protest [AFP] D 4
Mubarak Meets With Military Commanders D 4

JORDAN

Philip Habib Arrives in Amman for Talks F 1
Premier Badran Receives Habib F 1
Husayn, Al-Qasim Meet Habib F 1
Al-Qasim on Dispute With Syria in Kuwaiti Press F 1
AR-RA'Y Comments on Mitterrand Knesset Speech [5 Mar] F 2

SYRIA

Commentary on Habib Mission, Relations With U.S. H 1
Ba'thists, Greek Communists Hold Talks H 2
Al-Ahmar Receives Delegation H 2

ISRAEL

Knesset Holds Session in Honor of Mittterrand I 1
Savidor Speech I 1
Mitterrand Speech [Paris] I 2
Begin Speech I 6
Peres Speech I 11
Peres Describes Private Meeting With Mitterrand I 16
Begin Explains Lebanon Policy to Mitterrand I 17
'Circles' React to Mitterrand Knesset Speech I 17
Begin, French President Hold News Conference I 17
Mitterrand Stresses Importance of Visit I 26
Mitterrand Outlines Mideast Policy to Alignment I 26
Cheysson Says 'No Differences' With Begin I 27
France Pleased With Results of Mitterrand Visit I 27
France's Cheysson Meets With W. Bank Mayors I 28
Details of Meeting I 28
Appeal to Mitterrand Made on Expelled Mayors I 29
Detained Golan Druze Appeal to French President I 29
Begin Not To Attend Mitterrand Farewell I 29
Begin Suffering From 'Accumulated Fatigue' I 30
Undergoing Tests I 30
To Resume Regular Schedule I 30
Haddad Threatens Force Against Stronger UNIFIL I 30
IDF Evacuates 22 Families From Talme Yosef I 31
Settlers Return I 31
Further Evacuations in Yamit District Reported I 31

NORTH AFRICA

ALGERIA

Cultural Agreement With PLO Signed 4 Mar Q 1
FLN Signs Accord With Lebanese Amal Movement Q 1

LIBYA

Al-Qadhdhafi Addresses People's Congress 3 Mar Q 1
JANA: Saudi Arabia Leads Oil Price Reduction Q 11

SUDAN

Internal Affairs Minister on Political Issues Q 11
[Kuwait AS-SIYASAH 1 Mar]

WESTERN SAHARA

Abdelaziz Draws Conclusions From OAU Meeting Q 12

EAST AFRICA

ETHIOPIA

Mengistu Reportedly Injured in Eritrea [AFP] R 1

SOMALIA

DPRK Delegation Ends 5-Day Visit 25 Feb R 1

UGANDA

Outgoing PRC Ambassador Discusses Aid, Ties R 1

CENTRAL AFRICA

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Kolingba Dismisses Four in Cabinet Reshuffle [AFP] S 1
New Government List [AFP] S 1
AFP Reports Normal Situation in Bangui 4 Mar S 1

SOUTHERN AFRICA

MALAWI

Presidents Banda, Kaunda Hold Talks U 1

MOZAMBIQUE

Frontline States To Hold Summit 6-7 Mar U 1
Mugabe To Attend [Salisbury] U 1

SOUTH AFRICA

Minister on Sanctions, Soviet Penetration U 1

ZIMBABWE

Joshua Nkomo Comments on Present Situation [Bonn DIE WELT 3 Mar] U 2
Official Accuses United States in OAU Walkout [AFP] U 3

'ARAFAT: U.S. AID MAJOR OBSTACLE TO PLO CAUSE

PM041341 Rome L'ESPRESSO in Italian 28 Feb 82 pp 52-54

[Mario Scialoja undated interview in Beirut with PLO Chairman Yasir 'Arafat: "Coming Soon: War and Peace"]

[Excerpt] Beirut -- Question: According to the PLO's intentions 1981 should have been the year of the consolidation of your ties with the European countries. What has been achieved?

Answer: We have achieved positive results: It is enough to recall the major success achieved during my official visit to Greece.

Question: French President Mitterrand will soon be visiting Israel. What do you think of this?

Answer: I believe it is a bad thing. It seems to me an absurd initiative, especially since Mitterrand is the first French head of state to visit Israel and he has persisted with his intention to go there even after the annexation of the Golan. It is impossible for me to know what President Mitterrand has in mind, but certainly his decision goes against the interests of the Arab people.

Question: In recent months there has been talk of you paying an official visit to Italy. Berlinguer has agreed to receive you. The Socialists have hesitated and the other parties have refused. Do you believe the plan is still feasible?

Answer: Hitherto I received an invitation from the PCI. Circumstances have not yet permitted me to go and meet the communist friends but I hope to do so soon. As for an official visit to Italy, so far it has not been taken into specific consideration. Of course, if an invitation were forthcoming and if political circumstances permitted, it would be possible for me to make an official visit to your country.

Question: On his recent visit to Europe and the United States Egyptian President Husni Mubarak declared several times that "the key to peace in the Middle East lies in the solution of the Palestinian problem" and that the Palestinians must be regarded as "a free national entity." In your opinion, do these remarks imply a new Egyptian policy more favorable to your cause? Is Mubarak someone on whom you can depend?

Answer: We of the PLO judge words on the basis of the political results. It remains to be seen what Mubarak's specific political options will be. What concerns us above all is what stand the Egyptian president will adopt with regard to the Camp David agreement and the Palestinians' rights. He has spoken; now we await the actions.

Question: Mubarak has advised the Americans to begin a dialogue with the Palestinians, "among whom," he said, "there are many moderates." Do you believe he was referring to you and, if so, are you pleased with his assessment?

Answer: I do not know exactly what the term "moderate" means when used by President Mubarak, so I do not know whether or not I should be pleased with this definition.

Question: There are increasing rumors of an imminent Israeli attack in southern Lebanon, which would break the truce decided on last July. What truth is there here in these rumors, and what forecasts can you make?

Answer: There probably will be an attack in southern Lebanon. At present the Israelis have concentrated four divisions on the borders, all armed with the most sophisticated weapons. In any case it would not be the first or the last Israeli aggression. Israel's military junta is a well-organized official terrorist force. We have dealt with Israeli aggression in the past and we will deal with it in the future, too. We are not afraid because we have nothing to lose. However, I would like to add this: Let it be quite clear that there can be no Israeli aggression without a U.S. go-ahead. And the recent visit

by the head of Israeli military intelligence to U.S. Secretary of State Haig can be considered a request for the go-ahead for aggression. It is said that Washington has not yet given its authorization, but as far as we are concerned nothing is certain. We can only wait and see what will happen.

Question: The U.S. secretary of state espoused certain Israeli charges against the PLO when he said a few days ago that the threat of a violation of the truce stems from the fact that you are strengthening your military positions in southern Lebanon and that you have received a further major consignment of Soviet weapons.

Answer: There are UN forces monitoring southern Lebanon. If anything like that had nappened, they would know about it. A few days ago I met with the commander of the blue helmets, that is, the international peacekeeping forces, and I do not believe that their recent official report makes any mention of any new weapons of ours in the area. Moreover, the PLO has not received any new weapons from the USSR recently.

Question: The rejection front headed by the Syrians Caused the Arab summit in Fes to fail. What was the main source of disagreement, and what conditions must be satisfied to hold a summit that will have better chances of success?

Answer: It was not the Steadfastness Front that caused the summit to fail. It was King Hassan II who suggested postponing the conference, because there had been no preliminary discussions on the issues to be broached. The next summit will have to be properly prepared for, with a number of preliminary contacts among the various sides and with precise agreements already reached.

Question: If the eight-point plan presented by Saudi Arabia's Prince Fahd (which envisages the creation of an independent Palestinian state on the West Bank and in Gaza, with East Jerusalem as its capital) is put forward again, will you support it?

Answer: We greatly appreciated the Fahd plan. I have already said that I consider it an excellent platform for starting negotiations. After discussing it within the Palestinian alignment and after we reached an agreement, I submitted my observations on the plan to King Khalid and Prince Fahd. Of course, at the next Arab summit we will resume discussion of the plan, which is still on the agenda.

Question: You said some time ago that you would like to meet with Haig. Following Mubarak's visit to Reagan, do you believe your wish can be fulfilled more easily, and what would you ask the U.S. secretary of state?

Answer: I would like to advise Haig not to always have such a partisan viewpoint, that is, always on the Israelis' side. I would like to tell him that he must also take into account the Palestinian national rights which have been recognized by the United Nations. As for Mubarak, he has nothing to do with the matter.

Question: Do you believe that in the future Reagan could go beyond the Camp David stands and move closer to the Fahd plan?

Answer: At present there are no specific signs that suggest the possibility of such a fine occurrence. As for the distant future, I cannot predict what the Americans might think of.

Question: After 17 years of struggle what do you consider the major obstacle to your cause: your enemy's strength, Europe's indifference, the division of the Arab world?

Answer: The major obstacle is the unlimited aid Israel receives from the United States; vast military, strategic, economic, political and propagandist aid. The other two factors are important too, but for the time being they are lesser evils.

KHALAF WARNS LEBANESE OPPOSITION AGAINST ATTACKS

JN041852 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1630 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Excerpts] On the occasion of the first anniversary of the martyrdom of Iranian Mojahed Mohammad Saleh Hoseyni, martyr of Palestine and Iran, a public rally was held this afternoon in Jamal 'Abd an-Nasir Hall at Beirut Arab University. Brother Abu Iyad [Salah Khalaf], member of the Fatah Central Committee, delivered the speech of the Palestinian revolution at the rally.

Abu Iyad began by speaking about the characteristics of the martyr. He said: [begin recording] I knew him as a good, kind and soft-spoken person. I knew him as a courageous and dignified man at a time when we were in dire need of courage and dignity. I knew he possessed all these good characteristics which, unfortunately, are lacking in our societies.

On your anniversary, oh Brother Martyr, what do I say of the south. On your day, oh Brother Martyr, what do I say of those who this Saturday will issue death sentences against those who killed As-Sadat? What do I say when I am sure that in another part of this good country voices are heard in support of Khalid Islambuli [As-Sadat's assassin] and his comrades. We here, on the anniversary of martyr Mohammad Saleh Hoseyni, raise our voices high and tell the hangmen who want to execute Khalid Islambuli who vindicated the honor of Egypt, Arabs and Muslims; we here, raise our voices and tell all hangmen that Khalid Islambuli's blook shall turn into a curse if the death sentence is carried out against him. [applause]

We all read these days what Begin is saying so impudently. He says Husni Mubarak must visit us. He must visit Jerusalem and trample upon the Al-Taqsa Mosque and the Church of the Holy Sepulchure. He wants Mubarak to trample upon all our heritage and history just as As-Sadat did. Begin wants to involve Mubarak just as he involved As-Sadat. The Israeli ruler is now forcing the ruler of the biggest Arab country to visit Jerusalem and other places when he goes to Israel. What humiliation for the Arab nation!

Some Arab rulers are dreaming that after April, Husni Mubarak will come to them carrying the peace treaty on one shoulder and the Camp David accords on the other to lead Arab solidarity once again. We say, in all honesty and with the honor of revolutionaries, we cannot accept the return of Egypt under the peace treaty and the Camp David accords. Those who want to follow the Egypt of Camp David and the peace treaty are not Arabs but traitors of Arab solidarity and the Palestinian people. [applause]

We know a new trend is being prepared. They think it will be easy. Many Arab rulers are no longer afraid. They are no longer ashamed of themselves. Those who have the money think it can buy our souls and even our speech and silence. I tell all these people that this will never happen. True, the Arab liberation movement is on the decline. True, the situation of the Arab liberation movement has never been so bad. However, we are certain the Palestinian revolution, with all its revolutionary heritage, can reactivate the Arab liberation movement so it can assume its proper position.

Those Arabs, those mercenary pens in the Saudi and Gulf papers and in other papers, must never dream they can affect anyone of us. The boot of a small cub in the Palestinian revolution is too important to be affected by any of these mercenary writers. We are certain the day will come when these peoples, despite the suppression and persecution to which they are subjected, will make their rulers, who are hoarding gold and silver instead of spending them on charity, account for their actions.

We know where all these funds go. We know the people will make them account for all these funds. They think that if they withhold some funds from us, our fighter will not be able to eat. Our fighter gets 600 Lebanese pounds. We know they want to kill the spirit of the fighter and struggler. Nevertheless, our fighter is an honorable man. He will never be bought or sold with money.

Our fighter knows that some Arab states are withholding funds to make us kneel down and accept the settlement proposals made to them. There is an old saying that a freeman does not sell himself even if he starves.

Our respected brother, the shaykh, said a while ago that he would like to hear that one fighter was killed in Palestine or Israel. I believe he does not mean us of course. He means those who are fighting in the streets in the name of the Deuxieme Bureau. He means those who harm people in the name of the Lebanese National Movement, the Palestinian revolution or the Amal movement. He means the explosions in our streets financed by the Deuxieme Bureau, Basir al-Jumayyil and Israel to terrorize the citizens so they can say these areas are not safe and need proteciton. It is as if the placing of a booby-trapped car in a street is a great, courageous act. Do they not know that this is the basest and most cowardly act?

But who do you talk to? Do you talk to agents and tell them not to place explosions? But there is one thing, despite everything. I pledge in the honor of this revolution that we can plant the whole of their eastern quarter with explosions every day. [applause] But we are a humanitarian revolution. What have innocent people there got to do with this? Still there is a limit to our patience. If Bashir al-Jumayyil, the Deuxieme Bureau and the agents of Israel do not desist, there will be no safe areas. Explosions will go off everywhere, because we cannot see our people fall victim to explosions every day by a handful of agents. Where is the honor and conscience of the driver of the booby-trapped car?

We are saying this because we recall that martyr Mohammad Saleh Hoseyni was the victim of a cowardly and treacherous act. He was the victim of a treacherous bullet on the street such as the explosions taking place here and there. We know many Arab intelligence services are tampering with the Lebanese arena. One day, they tried to blow up a radio station. Had they done that, they would not have killed just the five of six employees in the radio station, but the 50 families, with all their women and children, on the 12 floors of that building.

Why? Because, they harbored hatred for voice of the workers radio run by Zahir al-Khatib. I may be against this radio, but should I blow up an entire building and all the families in it simply because I do not like what Zahir al-Khatib's radio says? Where is Arab honor? Would they allow such explosions in their countries? The Lebanese arena has suffered enough. The people have suffered enough. Still, the explosions continue. After booby-trapped cars, they turned to the exchange of artillery fire between camps. What do they want to say? Do some people want to turn communities against one another? Do they want to say that the Shiites are not with the Palestinians? I tell them: You are mistaken, the Shiites and their Imam Khomeyni are with the Palestinians.

We are aware of the victims and martyrs offered by the Lebanese people in defense of the Palestinian revolution and the Palestine question. We are aware of the sacrifices and sufferings of the Lebanese people because of our presence. All these matters prompt us more and more to stand in one trench, digging this trench with our hearts and eyes and deepening it until we succeed through it to return to our country.

On the first anniversary of martyr Mohammad Saleh Hoseyni, I say in the name of all my brothers, including Brother Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] who could not attend this ceremony because of his illness and who had good memories of martyr Abu Ahmad because he knew him better than I did; I say, in their name and all my brothers in the Fatah Central Committee and the leadership of the Palestinian revolution, that we are not expressing condolences to anyone, because we are the grieved party in the martyrdom of our beloved brother and martyr Mohammad Saleh Hoseyni. We felt his loss more than anyone else, because he was a part of our daily struggle. It is a revolution until victory. [end recording]

QADDUMI COMMENTS ON MITTERRAND REMARKS IN ISRAEL

NC050851 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 0530 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Commenting on the address delivered by French President Mitterrand at the Knesset and at the joint press conference with enemy Prime Minister Menahem Begin, the head of the PLO Political Department Abu al-Lutf [Faruq Qaddumi] said: The French president did not present the just Palestinian issue in its true perspective.

In Qaddumi's press conference in Algeria, he added: President Mitterrand spoke cautiously at the Knesset on some of our rights as if Israel had all the rights and we have only some. He added: Mitterrand believes priority must be given to the Israel entity, forgetting we have the rights stipulated in the UN Charter and resolutions. Mitterrand was extremely cautious when he did not submit the real question which should have priority. It is: the rights of the Palestinian people to existence, self-determination and the establishment of their state.

Brother Abu al-Lutf said: France, the great European state and Security Council member, must be more courageous in defending the right of peoples and international law. He added: We always hoped France would have an important role to play and would play it in a positive manner in defense of the Palestinian people's national rights. We also hoped Mitterrand would courageously declare the necessity of establishing a Palestinian state in occupied Palestine and not as he did in such a cautious manner when he insisted on defending the rights of the Israeli entity while knowing full well that it is not rights but usurpation operations to which the Palestinian people have fallen victim.

Brother Abu al-Lutf affirmed that Mitterrand's visit to Israel dashed our hopes of seeing France play the same role it did under General de Gaulle.

Asked about the possibility of inviting PLO Executive Committee Chairman Brother Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] to visit France, he said he did not consider it appropriate to speak about such a visit.

Chedli Klibi Remarks

LD050828 Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 0600 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Arab League Secretary General Chedli Klibi pointed out that the reaffirmation of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination is at the same time an affirmation that peace in the Middle East cannot be achieved unless this basic principle is respected. Klibi, answering an AFP question on the speech by President Mitterrand before the Knesset on 4 March, noted that the speech included a number of points which clarified France's attitude toward the Palestinian people, the PLO and the future of peace in the Middle East.

He said: Perhaps the most prominent point is the confirmation of the Palestinian people's right to a homeland and a state on its occupied land and the impossibility of asking any people to give up their identity, a confirmation which is in harmony with UN resolutions. He explained that the clear remark of the French president, that the cause of peace, freedom and justice in relation to peoples cannot be dealt with through deputization, indicates the extent of the Camp David accords' contradiction of these principles. The Camp David parties thought they were not bound by these principles in dealing with the issue of peace in the Middle East, and that they could solve the Palestinian problem through so-called self-rule. Klibi added: The importance of President Mitterrand's reference to the rights of Israel's neighboring countries to enjoy security and peace must also be noted because it comes at a time when the international community in a complete and absolute manner has condemned Israel for its aggression against southern Lebanon, the destruction of the Iraqi nuclear reactor and its annexation of the Golan.

Klibi expressed reservations with regard to the ambiguity still surrounding the French attitude toward the PLO and its recognition as sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. He expressed sorrow that the speech did not define the French attitude toward the annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan and Israel's continued building of settlements in the occupied Arab territories.

FATAH MEMBER WANTS MUBARAK TO CHANGE COURSE

NC051014 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 0645 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] A rally for solidarity with Egyptian struggler Khalid al-Islambuli and his comrades, who carried out the people's sentence against traitor As-Sadat was held at the Law Faculty of the Lebanese University yesterday afternoon. The rally was attended by Fatah Central Committee member Abu al-Hawl [Hayil 'Abd al-Hamid], Lebanese Socialist Progressive Party representative Riyad Ra'd, popular committees and Leagues grouping representative Ma'an Bashshur, Amal movement representative Hasan Yasin, and Lebanese people's forces representative Husayn Qubaysi.

Brother Abu al-Hawl delivered a speech on behalf of the Palestinian revolution at the rally. He said: When speaking about Khalid al-Islambuli and his comrades, we in fact speak about Egypt's history. He emphasized the Palestinian revolution's solidarity with Egypt's heroes who carried out the people's sentence against traitor As-Sadat.

Brother Abu al-Hawl called on Egyptian President Husni Mubarak to terminate As-Sadat's course. He pointed to the need for consolidating action to restore balance and change the balance of power in our favor because there is a plan aimed at the whole Arab nation. He affirmed the existence of strong relations with fraternal Syria and the Lebanese National Movement. He called on the national forces to bury their disagreements in the service of the common aim and fate.

'ARAFAT RECEIVES KUWAITI ENVOY, LEBANESE DEPUTY

JN041634 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1615 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Brother leader Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] received Kuwaiti Ambassador to Lebanon 'Abd al-Hamid al-Bu'ayjan this afternoon. It has been learned that Al-Bu'ayjan handed the brother leader a message from Kuwaiti Amir Jabir al-Ahmad, in which he inquired about his health after his recent indisposition.

Brother Abu 'Ammar also received Lebanese Deputy Husayn al-Husayni and discussed with him the current developments on the local and Arab levels as well as the developments in southern Lebanon.

Brother leader Abu 'Ammar earlier received a cable from Arab League Secretary General Chedli Klibi, in which he wished him good health after his indisposition.

DFLP LEADER: FEDAYEEN ACTION WILL ESCALATE

PM041001 Kuwait AL-WATAN in Arabic 28 Feb 82 p 10

[Interview with Nayif Hawatimah, secretary general of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, conducted by AL-QUDS on behalf of AL-WATAN, in Beirut "last week": "In the Next Phase There Will Be an Escalation of Fedayeen Action"]

[Excerpts] [Question] The fact that the United States cast its veto at the Security Council against the Jordanian-sponsored draft resolution calling for sanctions against Israel for annexing the Golan Heights proved something which had long been a point of contention among the Arabs. It proved that the United States is in fact Israel's full partner. What is the meaning of the U.S. veto, what practical steps can the Arabs agree on to counter the U.S. attitude instead of increasing their own differences and what are the confrontation states' responsibilities in this respect?

[Answer] The U.S. veto confirmed a number of facts. It denoted U.S. collusion in the Israeli expansionist decision. Their aim was to pressure and try to blackmail Syria because of Syria's position at the Arab summit held recently in Fes. They hoped to force Syria to change its position and to act in concert with the U.S. and Israeli policies and thus make it possible for them to subdue the whole region. The veto also reflected the U.S. attempts to prevent the United Nations and its various bodies from playing their natural role of preserving world peace and security and implementing UN resolutions.

One of the major aims of the United States and those collaborating with it is to torpedo the Baghdad summit resolutions which laid down the principles that should govern Arab solidarity. The first of these principles was refusal to have anything to do with the Camp David agreements and all its political consequences, including the recognition of the Zionist enemy, and imposing a blockade against the As-Sadat regime. This is why, at the Arab level, there should be an insistence on the Baghdad resolutions as a minimum. There is a need to go even further than these resolutions toward taking tangible steps against U.S. interests in the region and ending the policies advocating the return of Mubarak's Egypt to the Arab fold while it still follows As-Sadat's policies and has not abandoned the Camp David agreements and the peace treaty with Israel. It must be stressed here that, if these objectives are to be fulfilled, the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front states should, before anyone else, meet the following prerequisites:

1. The sixth Steadfastness and Confrontation Front summit should be held immediately. The role of the front should be enhanced through its joint political, military and economic organs. The front's efforts should be geared to full integration of its resources and the formulation of a clear policy against the U.S. and Israeli challenges and aggression, which culminated in the Israeli decision to annex the Golan Heights.

2. The masses should be given democratic freedoms to ensure their unlimited participation in the current conflict, including training and carrying arms. The masses should be allowed to exercise their right to political and trade union activity, free of all forms of police or intelligence service control.

3. The frontline confrontation triangle comprising Syria, the Palestinian revolution and the Lebanese nationalist forces should be given all necessary aid and support. Their military and material capabilities should be increased to enable them to face the mounting Israeli aggressiveness and be ready for confrontation, which is becoming more and more likely.

4. The various forms of resistance against U.S. imperialism and all states supporting Israeli aggression should be developed further. All kinds of economic and commercial dealings with them should be terminated, including the oil sector. On the other hand, the alliance with the socialist camp, especially the Soviet Union, should be strengthened and raised to the level of a firm strategic alliance, because that is the real effective basis of comprehensive Arab national steadfastness as a deterrent to counterbalance the U.S.-Israeli alliance.

[Question] Some people fear that Israel could translate the U.S. veto into some kind of action in southern Lebanon, and Lebanon in general, perhaps taking the form of limited military operations or strikes. Others believe that any limited war would lead to an all-out war in the region, especially if Israel took military action against the Syrian missiles or Syrian forces in Lebanon. Which of the two possibilities is the more likely, and do you believe the Palestinian resistance is capable of defending southern Lebanon in the event of large-scale fighting, as far as manpower and armaments are concerned?

[Answer] The Americans have not accepted the facts exposed by the collapse of the Fes conference. They have not accepted the fact that the initiative in the Arab-Israeli conflict is no longer in the hands of Washington and Tel Aviv. Nor have they accepted that that there is no possibility of a defeatist Palestinian trend emerging to take on itself the responsibility of joining the U.S.-Israeli-reactionary peace process. They refuse to accept that a reprieve for Husni Mubarak's regime depends on a number of major changes and developments in Egypt and the Arab world. That is why U.S. policy since the Fes conference has concentrated on the following:

1. Making concerted efforts at all levels to extricate Husni Mubarak from his present predicament in connection with Egypt's relaitions with Israel and the Arabs, on the basis of continued acceptance of the Camp David agreements and peace with Israel as being a fait accompli. Finding a way out for Mubarak's As-Sadat-like regime would, according the the Americans, open the door for other Arabs to join in.

2. Encouraging Israel to prepare for military aggression as an alternative ready for immediate implementation if the other efforts fail, but making such implementation subject to consultation between the two sides. The anticipated aggression would be against the Palestinian forces in southern Lebanon, but it could extend to the Syrian missiles in Al-Biqa', to deprive the Syrian forces of their air defense cover before dealing a heavy blow to them to force them to leave Lebanon and thus make success possible for the Lebanese Phalangist fascist plan to Zionize Lebanon.

Regardless of the scale of the aggression planned by Israel and the United States, it would open the way to all kinds of possibilities, including a general war on the Lebanese and Syrian fronts, and this would increase the Palestinian revolution's options for defending its masses and its national rights. It must be emphasized here

that no Israeli aggression would be a picnic, that the enemy would pay a high price. Syrian military capabilities have improved tangibly, thanks to the support and backing of the socialist states, especially the Soviet Union, which will make it possible to inflict heavy losses on the enemy and make the enemy's task extremely difficult.

[Question] To what extent will the significant drop in the number of major qualitative military operations affect the armed, political and popular struggle in the occupied territories? Is there really a new phase of Palestinian military action?

[Answer] First we must underline the link between the state of the revolution outside and the state of our masses inside the occupied territories. One is affected by the other.

A main feature of the past period of national struggle inside the occupied homeland was the expansion and steady growth of the popular struggle, which has now extended to all the national sectors and classes of our people, with the exception of a few discordant voices. Begin's declared iron fist policy and Sharon's so-called policy of moderation have failed to tame our people and their patriotic leadership and have failed to persuade them to go along with the Camp David schemes. The armed struggle of the revolution's popular forces in the occupied territories has not stopped. The enemy cannot deny this.

On the other hand, the revolution will actively and effectively continue its biggest armed struggle inside the occupied homeland. In this connection, there will be a noticeable escalation in the coming phase.

ISLAMIC CONFERENCE OFFICIAL ON IRAQ-IRAN CONFLICT

PM041153 Riyadh AR-RIYAD in Arabic 2 Mar 82 pp 1, 18

[Sulayman an-Nasir and 'Abd ar-Ra'uf Naji report]

[Excerpt] Habib Chatti, secretary general of the Islamic Conference Organization, has told AR-RIYAD that he hopes the plan submitted by the Islamic Conference's General Secretariat to end the Iraq-Iran conflict will be accepted by both sides. He added that the plan provides for the formation of three committees: one committee will be in charge of studying the main points of disagreement and submitting proposals for settling the dispute and bringing about a cease-fire. The second committee will deal with the question of the observers and Islamic forces which will be brought in to separate the two armies in the event of a cease-fire. The third committee will examine the task of resolving the differences.

Chatti added: When drawing up this plan we did our best to formulate it in such a way as to bring about a halt to the fighting. The Iranians justify the lack of a cease-fire by saying that as long as there are Iraqi forces on their territory they will never agree to peace with Iraq. On the other hand, the Iraqis say that unless they receive guarantees that their rights will be restored, they will not have peace with the Iranians.

Habib Chatti continued: It was on this basis that a committee has been asked to study the issue thoroughly and present proposals for a settlement, if the two sides approve. We have received Iraq's approval. The Iranian foreign minister has told me the plan has been submitted to the Iranian Defense Council, but no reply has been received yet.

Chatti said he met with the Iranian foreign minister in New York and before then.

The good offices committee set up by the second Islamic Conference, held in Mecca and At-Ta'If, is scheduled to meet in Jidda Friday to study what has been accomplished so far and discuss the steps to be taken by the committee toward promoting a solution through the above-mentioned plan and committees.

BAHRAIN

GOVERNMENT DENIES EXILES' REPORT ON DEATHS

NC041335 Paris AFP in English 0958 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Manama, 4 Mar (AFP) -- The Bahrain Government today denied a report from a group of Bahraini exiles in Tehran that six political detainees had died recently under torture.

The report, issued by the Bahrain Islamic liberation front and reported yesterday by newspapers in Tehran, said that 73 other opposition members were currently on trial and could face the death penalty.

It also said reports had indicated that 3,000 people have been arrested in Bahrain in the past two months.

But a statement issued today by the Bahrain Government said: "There exist in Iran numerous irresponsible parties, which spread lies concerning Bahrain."

The Bahraini Islamic liberation front is supported by Iran and has been accused by Manama authorities of being behind a plot there last December.

TUNISIAN PRIME MINISTER ARRIVES FOR TALKS

GF041024 Manama WAKH in Arabic 0850 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Excerpt] Manama, 4 Mar (WAKH) -- Tunisian Prime Minister Mohamed Mzali arrived here from Doha this morning for a 3-day official visit to Bahrain on his current tour of the region.

He was received on arrival by Bahraini Prime Minister Shaykh Khalifah ibn Salman Al Khalifah, ministers, the Saudi ambassador and dean of the diplomatic corps and a number of Bahraini officials.

During this visit, Mr Mzali will hold talks with Bahraini Prime Minister Shaykh Khalifah ibn Salman Khalifah. These talks will focus on bilateral relations and means of enhancing them in all fields as well as a number of Gulf, Arab and international issues and the means of restoring Arab solidarity.

Meets With Amir

GF041226 Manama WAKH in Arabic 0950 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Excerpt] Manama, 4 Mar (WAKH) -- Bahraini Amir Shaykh 'Isa ibn Salman Al Khalifah has received a message from Tunisian President Habib Bourghiba that deals with bilateral relations and Tunisia's stand on current Gulf and Arab events. The message was delivered by Tunisian Prime Minister Mohamed Mzali during his meeting with the amir today.

The meeting was attended by Bahraini Prime Minister Shaykh Khalifah ibn Salman Al Khalifah, Bahraini Foreign Affairs Minister Shaykh Muhammad ibn Mubarak Al Khalifah and Education Minister Dr 'Ali Fakhru.

TUNISIAN MINISTER ON MZALI'S TOUR, GULF WAR

GF041225 Manama WAKH in Arabic 0650 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Manama, 4 Mar (WAKH) -- Tunisian Information Minister Tahar Belkhojda has reiterated his country's support for the GCC. He said: We consider this grouping an example to be followed because it is a practical model based on the environment, the requirements for its growth and the challenges facing it.

He emphasized that such forms of cooperation will ultimately lead to Arab solidarity and unity. He said these regional Arab groupings, which are founded on sound and natural bases for cooperation within the framework of conformity on goals, will pave the way for influential and mature Arab strength.

In a statement in today's issue of the Bahraini newspaper AKHBAR AL-KHALIJ, Mr Belkhojda said Tunisian Prime Minister Mohamed Mzali is currently touring countries of the region to hold consultations and discussions with the leaders of these countries on various projects in the political, economic and social fields.

On the recent sabotage plot uncovered in Bahrain, he said: We support Bahrain in its stand on this plot. We wish the region all good and security. We hope the Gulf states will live in permanent peace that ensures continuous progress and development in various fields.

The Tunisian information minister expressed his concern over the Iraqi-Iranian war. He called for stopping this war, which is sapping Arab strength and resources.

Asked if the Arab Maghreb countries can achieve cooperation, he said: Tunisia supports this view because these countries have a common basis and common and identical interests that can put an end to their old problems.

Asked about the goal of Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi's recent visit to Tunisia, he said: The purpose was to discuss a number of suspended issues between the two countries and means of finding appropriate solutions to ensure the development of good relations between the two neighbors.

He expressed the hope that the visit will help to enhance these relations and expand the scope of their cooperation.

The Tunisian minister stressed that the Arab media have achieved some successes following the successes of Arab policy due to its authenticity and adept maneuvers, particularly since challenges of the countermedia are enormous and are well planned to thwart any Arab media campaign.

KUWAITI MILITARY OFFICIAL DEPARTS 4 MARCH

GF042000 Manama WAKH in Arabic 1820 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Manama, 4 Mar (WAKH) -- Kuwaiti Chief of Staff Maj Gen 'Abdallah Farraj al-Ghanim left Manama today for home after a 3-day visit to Bahrain. During the visit Major General al-Ghanim held talks with officials in the Bahrain defense force dealing with means of bolstering military cooperation between the two countries.

He was seen off by Chief of Staff Brig Gen Shaykh Khalifah ibn Ahmad Al Khalifah, senior officers of the Bahrain defense force and Kuwaiti Charge d'Affaires Khalaf 'Abbas al-Khalaf.

KUWAIT

CHIEF OF STAFF ON GULF MILITARY INDUSTRY PLANS

PM041523 Riyadh AL-JAZIRAH in Arabic 1 Mar 82 p 1

['Adnan al-Muhanna report: "Kuwaiti Chief of Staff Tells AL-JAZIRAH: Establishment of Gulf Authority for Military Industry To Be Discussed in March"]

[Excerpt] At-Ta'if -- Kuwaiti Chief of Staff Maj Gen 'Abdallah al-Ghanim has set 15 March as the date for discussing the establishment of a Gulf authority for the military industry.

Major General al-Ghanim told AL-JAZIRAH that this subject will be fully discussed, because it would serve Arab interests and help in realizing the Gulf people's aspirations and objectives.

He expressed optimism over the resolutions and recommendations adopted by the conference of GCC defense ministers, saying that they constitute a strong push for cooperation and coordination between the member states in all the fields, particularly the military field.

He said that his visit to the kingdom was successful and expressed happiness at meeting His Royal Highness Minister of Defense and Aviation Amir Sultan ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz.

Maj Gen 'Abdallah al-Ghanim and the delegation accompanying him arrived yesterday afternoon at Amir Fahd's air base in At-Ta'if on a visit to the kingdom.

PUBLICATION OF AL-MUJATAWA' SUSPENDED 2 WEEKS

GF050456 Ooha QNA in Arabic 1955 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Kuwait, 4 Mar (QNA) -- The Kuwaiti Information Ministry decided today to suspend publication of the magazine AL-MUJATAMA' for 2 weeks for publishing material in violation of the publication law. The decision stated that the suspension was as a result of what has been published on Syria.

OMAN

MALAYSIAN PRIME MINISTER HOLDS OFFICIAL TALKS

GF050528 Muscat Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Official talks between the Omani side led by His Highness ath-Thiwayni ibn Shihab, the sultan's special adviser and governor of Muscat,and the Malaysian side led by Dr Mahathir bin Mohamed, prime minister and minister of defense, were concluded at the (Al-Hibrah) guest palace today.

The 2-hour session was attended on the Malaysian side by the delegation accompanying the Malaysian prime minister,and on the Omani side by Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Yusuf al-'Alawi 'Abdallah, the under secretaries of the Ministries of Industry and Commerce, Education and Petroleum and Minerals and the secretary of public finance.

In a statement to the radio correspondent and to the newspaper 'UMAN, Minister of State for Foreign Affaris Yusuf al-'Alawi 'Abdallah said: Malaysian Prime Minister Dr Mahathir bin Mohamed yesterday heard a detailed explanation from His Majesty Sultan Qabus on the Omani view on Arab and Islamic issues.

The minister of state for foreign affairs added: During yesterday's meeting His Majesty Sultan Qabus and the Malaysian prime minister reviewed the Iraqi-Iranian war. The two sides expressed their great concern over the armed conflict between the two Muslim countries. They expressed the hope that the Islamic Good Offices Committee would be able to reach an acceptable solution to the existing problems with the two countries. Yusuf al-'Alawi 'Abdallah declared: Oman and Malaysia strongly support the efforts of the Islamic Good Offices Committee to end the bloodshed between the two countries.

Yusuf al-'Alawi 'Abdallah added: The Malaysian prime minister's visit to Oman is important, particularly as it takes place in the present circumstances of the Muslim world.

Referring to today's round of talks, the minister of state for foreign affairs noted: The two sides reviewed bilateral relations and the possibility of joint cooperation in trade, investment and training. He said that the Malaysian side expressed readiness to welcome Omani students for training in Malaysian universities.

The minister of state for foreign affairs told radio and 'UMAN correspondents: The two countries reject Soviet hegemony and the expansion of Soviet influence in the Third World. He added: Just as Oman is the victim of communist aggression, Malaysia is also the victim of the onslaught of communist influence exported by the Soviet Union.

QATAR

BAHRAIN'S CONDUCT ON DISPUTED AREAS PROTESTED

GF041655 Doha Domestic Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Statement issued by Government of State of Qatar, date not given -- read by announcer]

[Text] Radio Bahrain reported on 3 March 1982 that His Highness Saykh Khalifah ibn Salman Al Khalifah, the prime minister of Bahrain, had launched a Bahraini warship named the Hawar. Bahraini television screened a film on the launching ceremony.

Bahrain radio also broadcast a statement by the coast guard authority that its naval units had carried out exercises with live ammunition in the (Fasht ad-Dibal) area today, Thursday, 4 March.

As for naming a Bahraini warship Hawar, the State of Qatar considers this a provocative action. The name Hawar is the name of islands over which, despite the fact that they lie inside Qatari territorial waters and therefore are subject to Qatari sovereignty, Bahrain has provoked a dispute which Qatar has rejected from the day the dispute was raised to this day. All categorical, legal, historical, geographical and security evidence furnishes irrefutable proof of the invalidity of the Bahraini claim that these islands are subject to Bahraini sovereignty.

Moreover, the two countries had agreed to accept the mediation of an elder sister country regarding this dispute. This mediation to resolve the dispute amicably is continuing.

As for the exercises with live ammunition in the (Fasht ad-Dibal) area, this action is also provocative because sovereignty over this area is also unjustly disputed by Bahrain. The delineation of the median line between the Qatari continental shelf and the Bahraini continental shelf depends on the results of the settlement of this dispute.

In view of the fact that Bahrain has long resorted to provocative actions, and indeed acts of aggression, against the Hawar islands and the area of the median line between the two states, in total disregard of what was agreed upon to avoid anything likely to complicate the dispute between them and in order to facilitate endeavors to resolve the dispute amicably -- and despite the fact that the line pursued by Qatar has always been one that demonstrated Qatar's anxiousness to preserve the fraternal relations between the two sister countries and to avoid anything likely to undermine these relations -- therefore, the Government of Qatar strongly protests the aforementioned conduct and holds the Government of Bahrain fully responsible for the results of its actions, including measures which the Government of Qatar believes should be taken in the face of such actions.

SAUDI ARABIA

AL-QADHDHAFI DEPLORED FOR 'MALICIOUS ATTACKS'

LD041326 Riyadh SPA in English 1202 GMT 4 Mar 82

[From the press review]

[Excerpt] Riyadh, 4 Mar (SPA) -- Deploration of Col al-Qadhdhafi's malicious attacks on the kingdom, the Islamic peace committee's meeting tomorrow in Jidda and French President Mitterrand's current visit to Israel appeared for editorial comments in today's newspapers.

Dealing with Libyan leaders' attempts to further deepen the Arab rifts and Al-Qadhdhafi's total alliance with communism, AL-JAZIRAH noted the Russian communists have found Al-Qadhdhafi as the most obedient servant of communist alliance among the Third World leaders for implementing their communist strategies and designs in the Third World.

The paper felt it has now become quite clear to all that Al-Qadhdhafi's prime concern now is to fight Islam because of his irrational attitude and attacks against the kingdom, which has always been considered as the first Islamic state.

AL-JAZIRAH observed Al-Qadhdhafi was misusing the Libyan funds through his criminal actions in his own country and abroad in the service of communists objectives.

The paper disclosed Libya was running short of finance and oil revenues because of Al-Qadhdhafi's foolish policy aiming at destruction and subversion.

The paper asked whether Al-Qadhdhafi had been giving any aid to the Palestine Liberation Organization similar to its lavish aid accorded to mercenaries who are also receiving training in Libya for carrying out subversive actions throughout the world.

Commenting on the same subject, AL-MADINAH described Al-Qadhdhafi as a dangerous maniac who is exploiting the money of the good-natured Libyan people for creating areas of tension all over the world. The paper said Al-Qadhdhafi is also exporting troubles and unrest to neighbouring Arab nations such as Sudan and unshamingly contributing towards the division of the Arab nation. The paper criticised the illogical attack of Al-Qadhdhafi on the kingdom's oil policy, which has always taken into account the interests of the poor nations facing hardships and are not able to pay even a cent more for their oil requirements. The paper noted the kingdom was the first country to use the oil weapon in 1973 against Europe and that Al-Qadhdhafi was the first leader to break the Arab unanimity by selling Libyan oil to the European countries.

AL-BILAD observed Al-Qadhdhafi's attack on the kingdom was "not something new" as the Libyan leader had been constantly trying in the past to slander Saudi Arabia's pioneering role in consolidating Arab causes and ranks.

The paper said the kingdom's leaderships foresight and wise policy could easily be ascertained through its moderate stance and useful contributions in OPEC, North-South dialogue and Arab conferences.

Radio Commentary

LD042308 Riyadh Domestic Service in Arabic 2000 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Commentary prepared by Husayn al-'Askari and presented by Ahmad al-Hariri]

[Excerpts] Colonel al-Qadhdhafi has said that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is trying to starve the Libyan people and the peoples of some oil-producing countries as a result of what he called Saudi policy in the international oil market.

In order for a human being to rise to the level of correct understanding, he must have a minimum level of understanding or the [words indistinct] facts. Colonel al-Qadhdhafi is known to persist with not dealing with facts but persists in trying to bring clear-cut matters down to his level of understanding rather than rise to them. That is the main reason for what characterizes the man's behavior, and it is the distinguishing feature of all statements that come from him, with which he wants to attract attention to himself and to what he says. It is enough to make the Arabs, even all mankind, laugh and cry when Colonel al-Qadhdhafi encroaches on facts and strives to subject them to his [word indistinct] understanding.

The kingdom, whose dealings in the international oil market are ruled by an awareness of direction and correct perception based principally on research and thorough deliberations carried out within the framework of OPEC, of which the kingdom forms one of the strong pillars, and because the operation is very complex due to being linked to the development of the international economic movement and its strategic needs, has and will remain strongly attached with its OPEC partners to the [word indistinct], deepening and continuation of its dealings in its oil policy on the bases of a balance between principles and (?interests) [passage indistinct]. Of course, this balance in dealing with the facts of matters does not meet with Colonel al-Qadhdhafi's understanding.

It is not the kingdom's fault that Colonel al-Qadhdhafi cannot rise to the level of understanding the reality of the (?prevailing) role in the Arab and international arenas, and that he attempts through illusions and lies to subject matters to his simple mind and limited views. [passage indistinct]

UAE PRESIDENT ZAYID ARRIVES IN RIYADH 4 MAR

GF041950 Riyadh Domestic Television Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Excerpt] UAE President His Highness Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan arrived in Riyadh this morning. He was received by His Majesty King Khalid ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, Defense and Aviation Minister His Royal Highness Prince Sultan ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz and a number of senior officials.

The UAE president is accompanied by a delegation of senior state officials that include Shaykh Rashid ibn Ahmad al-Mu'alla, member of the Supreme Council and ruler of Umm al-Quwayn; Shaykh Muhammad ibn Rashid, defense minister; Ahmad ibn Khalifah as-Suwaydi, the representative of the UAE president; and Hamud ibn 'Ali, minister of state for internal affairs.

UAE

IRAN'S 'AZIZI MEETS DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER

GF041440 Abu Dhabi Domestic Service in Arabic 1230 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Shaykh Maktum ibn Rashid al-Maktum, the UAE deputy prime minister and Dubai heir apparent, today received Ahmad 'Azizi, under secretary of the Iranian Foreign Ministry, who is currently visiting the country. The meeting was attended by Hamdan ibn Rashid, the UAE finance and industry minister and acting economy and trade minister.

Shaykh Maktum affirmed to his Iranian guest that the war between the fraternal countries of Iraq and Iran serves only the interests of the common enemy. He expressed hope that the war will end as soon as possible and that peace and security will be established between the two countries.

MUHYI AD-DIN REVIEWS PEACE POLICY WITH EEC GROUP

NC041403 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1314 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 4 Mar (MENA) -- Prime Minister Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din received the delegation of the socialist group in the European Parliament headed by Ernest Glenn currently visiting Cairo.

Muhyi ad-Din stressed to the delegation members that peace is a strategic policy for Egypt and that the autonomy talks will continue before and after 25 April in implementation of the Camp David agreements. He stressed Egypt's appreciation of the EEC's interest in strengthening stability in the Middle East.

Muhyi ad-Din also expounded on Egypt's political and economic ideology and its adherence to the economic open-door policy, support for the public sector and encouraging the private sector and foreign capital.

European Delegation Departs

NC051038 Cairo MENA in English 0955 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 5 Mar (MENA) -- Ernest Glenn, chairman of the socialists group in the European Parliament and his delegation left here today for Tel Aviv following a three-day visit to Egypt.

President Husni Mubarak had received the delegation while here.

The delegation also held talks with a number of Egyptian officials on the role Europe can play in bringing about peace in the Middle East and the latest developments in the autonomy talks.

They also got acquainted with the Egyptian foreign and home policies particularly in the economic domain.

AUTONOMY TECHNICAL TEAMS CONCLUDE MEETINGS

NC041937 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1851 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 4 Mar (MENA) -- This evening the tripartite Egyptian-Israeli-U.S. working committee on the autonomy negotiations concluded its meetings which began in Cairo on 1 March. During this round some problems impeding the preparation of a draft declaration regarding the powers and jurisdiction of the autonomy authority were discussed. Each side presented its views on these problems, which included the issue of security. Egypt reaffirmed its position that security means security for all the parties, including the Palestinians, and does not mean Israel's security only. Egypt rejected the basis of Israel's view on the concept of security. Egypt also affirmed during these talks that the proposed Palestinian authority should enjoy all the powers currently assumed by the Israeli administration in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Egypt also affirmed its rejection of the settlements, which are considered an obstacle to peace. It also affirmed the need for abiding by all the provisions in the Camp David accords regarding Palestinian autonomy.

Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali is scheduled to meet with the Egyptian delegation in the tripartite working committee the day after tomorrow, Saturday, to review the results of this round of talks.

Israeli Delegation Departs

NC042146 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2045 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 4 Mar (MENA) -- Hayim Kubersky, head of the Israeli side in the tripartite Egyptian-Israeli-U.S. working committee on the autonomy negotiation, and his accompanying delegation left Cairo this evening after participating in the meetings of the committee which were concluded this evening.

The Israeli delegation was seen off at the airport by the Foreign Ministry's deputy director of protocol, Ahmad Sa'id.

GHALI COMMENTS ON MITTERRAND KNESSET SPEECH

NC050829 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 0800 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali told the French newspaper LE FIGARO that French President Francois Mitterrand's speech at the Israeli Knesset underlines the continuity of the French policy. He said that the French president has used the word 'state', thus affirming his stand which recognized the importance and necessity of establishing a Palestinian state.

More Ghali Comments

NC041944 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1850 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 4 Mar (MENA) -- Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Dr Butrus Ghali has expressed Egypt's welcome of the remarks made in the speech by French President Francois Mitterrans's in the Israeli Knesset today concerning a Palestinian state.

Dr Ghali sayd: We hope that this will be an encouraging factor to Europe to play a positive role that could give a push to the process of a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

PRIME MINISTER HOLDS TALKS WITH DPRK OFFICIAL

NC041355 Cairo EMNA in Arabic 1310 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 4 Mar (MENA) -- Prime Minister Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din has received DPRK Vice Premier Kong Chin-tae and the delegation accompanying him currently visiting Cairo. During the meeting, which was also attended by DPRK Ambassador in Cairo Kang Man-su, they reviewed the excellend bilateral relations in various domains and the role played by both countries in the Nonaligned Movement. Muhyi ad-Din expressed Egypt's appreciation of the DPRK's stand in support of Egypt's peace efforts to find a just solution to the Middle East problem.

'Ali Receives Vice Premier

NC041516 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1350 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 4 Mar (MENA) -- Kamal Hasan 'Ali, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, today met with DPRK Vice Premier Kong Chin-tae and the delegation accompanying him which is currently visiting Cairo. After the 90-minute meeting, Foreign Ministry Spokesman Ra'uf Ghunaym said both sides made a comprehensive review of the international problems. The DPRK side submitted a comprehensive review of the policy pursued by the DPRK regarding various international questions, particularly the Middle East question. He stressed the DPRK's support for Egypt's policy which is aimed at achieving the Arab goals and a just and comprehensive peace in the area.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman said the DPRK side reviewed their country's views on the Korean problem and the peaceful unification of North and South Korea. He further said the discussions dealt with issues relevant to the Nonaligned Movement and its current status. The DPRK side also reviewed the attempts at polarization within the Nonaligned Movement and the attempts to subvert it from within.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman said the DPRK and Egyptian sides have agreed to cooperate to protect the Nonaligned Movement from the dangers of polarization and subservience.

Ghunaym said 'Ali expounded at length on the current situation in the Middle East, Egypt's position on it, and the future of the peace process in the area.

The Egyptian side included Foreign Ministry Under Secretary Ambassador 'Imran ash-Shafi'i, Mahmud Fathi, Ambassador Sa'd Khalil, and Ambassador Ra'uf Ghunaym.

'Ali Hosts Banquet

NC041922 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1830 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali has stressed that the Nonaligned Movement is today required more than ever before to play its historic role in defending the interests and security of the Third World peoples. He said that the Nonaligned Movement will not be able to do so unless it lifts the restrictions of polarization and subservience and asserts its independence and freedom.

During a banquet this afternoon in honor of DPRK Vice Premier Kong Chin-tae, 'Ali praised the DPRK's stand in the nonaligned group and its efforts to strengthen the movement's independence to ensure that it will not be subservient to the big powers. These efforts are in keeping with the Egyptian stand, making them an important point of agreement on the path of Egyptian-DPRK friendship.

'Ali further said that Egypt, as a founder country of the Nonaligned Movement, is ready for sincere action with the DPRK and all the nonaligned members who believe in its goals for the prosperity of the world's peoples.

MUBARAK CABLES RAWLINGS ON INDEPENDENCE DAY

NC051052 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1005 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 5 Mar (MENA) -- President Muhammad Husni Mubarak has sent the following cable of good wishes to Ghanaian head of state Jerry Rawlings on Ghana's independence anniversary:

It pleases me to express to Your Excellency most heartfelt congratulations on the occasion of your celebration of independence day, hoping that the relations of amity and friendship between our two peoples will further develop and grow in their mutual interest and in serving the aims of our developing continent which is facing enormous challenges and that our peoples will participate in building a better international society.

I send you my most sincere greetings, wishing you good health and happiness and your fraternal people further progress and advancement, coupled with my highest esteem and appreciation.

CAIRO WEEKLY NOTES RETURN OF 'ARAB FEDERATIONS'

PM041301 Cairo AL-AHRAR in Arabic 1 Mar 82 p 1

[Fayiz Zayid report: "Arab Professional Federations Have Returned to Their Cairo Headquarters"]

[Text] Rif'at ash-Shahawi, secretary general of the [Socialist] Labor Party, has stated that the Arab professional federations have decided to resume their activities at their headquarters in Cairo. These federations have been out of Cairo since 1977, when they moved out in protest against the peace initiative.

Addressing the party's weekly meeting Tuesday [23 February], Ash-Shahawi said that the General Secretariat of the Arab Lawyers Federation held a meeting in Cairo Tuesday for the first time in 4 years.

He added that the return of the Arab professional federations to Cairo calls for optimism regarding the restoration of Egyptian-Arab relations under President Husni Mubarak.

MUBARAK URGES 'RETURN TO SPIRIT OF ISLAM'

PM050803 London ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 4 Mar 82 p 1

[ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT Cairo Bureau Report]

[Text] ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT has leanred that Egyptian President Muhammad Husni Mubarak has asked the People's Assembly to speed up the drafting of the Islamic Shari'a laws and have them ready by the end of the current parliamentary session.

In his directives to Dr Muhammad Mahjub, chairman of the People Assembly's Religious Affairs Committee, President Mubarak said that there must be a return to the spirit of Islam and that trends not in keeping with religion and the law must be discarded.

Dr Muhjub has stated that the drafting of the civil law on the basis of the Islamic Shari'a will be completed during the current People's Assembly session. He added that in the next few days the assembly's Religious Affairs Committee will seek the opinions of a number of Al-Azhar shaykhs and other religious leaders to get the benefit of their views in the research on this matter.

TRIAL OF DEFENSE LAWYER DELAYED AFTER PROTEST

NC041901 Paris AFP in English 1833 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Cairo, 4 Mar (AFP) -- The trial of 'Abd al-Halim Ramadan, a defense lawyer in the trial of president Anwar as-Sadat's alleged assassins, who accused the military court of falsifying court records on the case, today was postponed until Tuesday, it was reported.

The military court made the decision after the 60 defense lawyers, including former president of the bar Ahmad al-Khawaja, backed up Mr Ramadan's charges of falsified records.

The court ordered the public prosecutor to investigate the accusations.

Defense lawyers said Mr Ramadan had charged the high military court trying the 24 alleged assassins with "violating all laws and falsifying records". They said he was then arrested in court and brought before another tribunal on contempt charges.

The 60 defense lawyers were barred entry to the courtroom at yesterday's session, replaced by 15 court-appointed lawyers, and told a final verdict in the assassination case would be handed down Saturday.

The move was immediately denounced by the lawyers, who have attended hearings since the trial began on November 21.

MUBARAK MEETS WITH MILITARY COMMANDERS

NC041850 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1800 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Ismailia, 4 Mar (MENA) -- President Muhammad Husni Mubarak today met with a large number of commanders, officers, noncommissioned officers and soldiers of the armed forces in Ismailia in a familial gathering that lasted well over 2 hours. During the meeting, President Mubarak spoke about the political situation and the development of the armed forces. He also listened to many questions and inquiries from officers and soldiers and answered them frankly and clearly. (?Attending) the meeting of President Mubarak with the armed forces officers were Minister of Defense and War Production Lt Gen 'Abd al-Halim Abu Ghazalah, Commander of the 2ND Field Army Lt Gen Salah ad-Din 'Abd al-Halim, and a number of senior armed forces commanders.

PHILIP HABIB ARRIVES IN AMMAN FOR TALKS

JN031614 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 3 Mar 82

[Text] U.S. envoy Philip Habib arrived in Amman this afternoon on a 2-day visit to Jordan, during which he will meet with a number of high-ranking Jordanian officials for talks on consolidating Jordanian-U.S. relations and the most important issues in the region.

A number of high-ranking Jordanian Foreign Ministry officials and the U.S. ambassador in Amman met him at Amman airport.

Premier Badran R. eives Habib

JN041224 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1200 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Prime Minister Mudar Badran today received in his office U.S. envoy Philip Habib in the presence of Foreign Minister Marwan al-Qasim and the U.S. ambassador in Amman. The discussion during this meeting dealt with the situation in southern Lebanon.

Husayn, Al-Qasim Meet Habib

JN041520 Amman PETRA-JNA in Arabic 1445 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Amman, 4 Mar (PETRA) -- His Majesty King Husayn received at Al-Hummar Palace at noon today U.S. envoy Philip Habib and reviewed with him the current developments in the Middle East region in general and in Lebanon in particular.

The meeting was attended by His Highness Crown Prince Hasan, Prime Minister Mudar Badran, Royal Hashemite Court Chief Ahmad al-Lawzi, Armed Forces Commander in Chief ash-Sharif Zayd ibn Shakir and Foreign Minister Marwan al-Qasim. The U.S. ambassador in Amman also attended the meeting.

Earlier this morning, Philip Habib was received by Foreign Minister Marwan al-Qasim in his office. Habib briefed him on the efforts he is exerting to maintain the cease-fire in southern Lebanon.

Al-Qasim explained to the U.S. envoy that Israel is behind what is happening in Lebanon and added that Israel has dismembered this country, worked against the return of stability and peace and prevented the UN forces from carrying out their tasks. He stressed that Israel's ambitions to control southern Lebanon and the water resources complement its plans to expand at the expense of Arab rights and territories and its refusal to abide by the international resolutions which defined the bases of a just and lasting peace in the region.

The minister called for pooling efforts to put an end to Israel's continuous interference in Lebanon's affairs so that the Lebanese can agree to a framework through which a national reconciliation among the various factions can be achieved to put an end to Lebanon's tragedy.

AL-QASIM ON DISPUTE WITH SYRIA IN KUWAITI PRESS

JN042036 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Foreign Minister Marwan al-Qasim has revealed that one reason for the Jordanian-Syrian dispute is the Iraqi-Iranian war and Jordan's stand toward Iraq. In a statement published today by Kuwaiti papers AS-SIYASAH and ARAB TIMES, he said that Jordan's attitude toward the presence of the Syrian [Arab] Deterrent Forces in Lebanon is another reason for the Jordanian-Syrian dispute.

Al-Qasim denied that the Jordanian-Iraqi rapprochement poses a danger to Syria. He asserted that this is because Jordan does not form an axis with one Arab front against another.

The foreign minister added that there is a principled Arab stand which Jordan adopts toward any Arab state exposed to aggression. We shared in the 1973 war by sending the two best Jordanian brigades to the Golan to jointly confront Israel. Stemming from this stand, we sent volunteers to Iraq. However, these are not armed forces and Iraq has not asked us for them.

Al-Qasim asserted that Jordan supports the Saudi plan for settling the Middle East crisis because the plan stems from the principles of the Baghdad summit and does not conflict with its resolutions. He said that there is a U.S.-Jordanian committee which meets to discuss matters related to the import of previously approved military equipment from the United States.

AR-RA'Y COMMENTS ON MITTERRAND KNESSET SPEECH

JN050853 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0500 GMT 5 Mar 82

[From the press review]

[Text] Under the headline "Remarks on Mitterrand's Speech," AR-RA'Y says: President Mitterrand tried to make his speech delivered before the Knesset yesterday look balanced. The speech did contain positive elements, represented by his reference to the right of West Bank and Gaza inhabitants to determine their future and establish a state. President Mitterrand broke with Israeli tradition, which forbids mentioning the PLO before the Knesset.

Nonetheless, the French president linked the issue of self-determination and the PLO's participation in the peace process to certain conditions, such as mutual prior recognition between the PLO and Israel. Mitterrand, at the same time, was content to express France's apprehension about individual practices by this or that side which are bound to increase the difficulties hindering the peace process.

In his talk about Jerusalem, President Mitterrand preferred to use certain expressions. He described it as a land of unity and contradictions. He then referred to the greatness of the Arab people and the civilization they inherited. This definitely implies the rejection of Jewish claims concerning the history of Jerusalem.

AR-RA'Y adds: Despite the fact that Mitterrand's speech was very carefully shaped and did not include any sharp stands of expression, Israeli reaction, represented in Begin's speech, was negative and overloaded with no's because Begin rejected anew the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, a Palestinian homeland, a Palestinian state and the PLO. This result was not only expected by Arabs but by French circles and press who opposed the French president's visit to Israel and urged him not to go.

An important question is now raised about the advantages of the visit as long as Israel hastened to reject the French stand toward the cause and as long as Mitterrand asserted that France would not play mediator or judge. These advantages, it seems, are represented in the alleviation of the isolation imposed on Israel by Europe at a time when Israel is not making any effort to retract its stubborn stand.

AR-RA'Y concludes: At any rate, many aspects are linked with Mitterrand's visit to Israel which deserve to be discussed in light of its repercusions and effects.

COMMENTARY ON HABIB MISSION, RELATIONS WITH U.S.

JN041926 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1215 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Station commentary]

[Text] Philip Habib, U.S. President Ronald Reagan's personal envoy, has conveyed a letter from the U.S. President to President Hafiz al-Asad, who gave him a reply letter to the U.S. President. The exchange between heads of state is a familiar method for exchanging views.

It is no secret that relations between Syria and the United States are not now at their best, especially following the move by the U.S. Government defending Israel's aggressive and expansionist step in the Golan at the UN Security Council vetoing a majority decision recommending sanctions against Israel according to the UN Charter.

There is also the U.S. Government stand at the UN General Assembly, exerting pressure on other countries to vote against a resolution on imposing sanctions on Israel. This violated the principles and provisions of the UN Charter and international law.

In addition to open hostility to Syria in particular and the Arab nation in general, the United States adopted a significantly provocative stand by inciting the remnants of the agent Muslim Brotherhood gang against the internal Syrian front. It also interfered in Syria's domestic affairs in an official capacity through the official spokesman of the U.S. States Department. This is unusual in international relations.

As is well-known, the Syrian masses, under the leadership of President Hafiz al-Asad and the Arab Ba'thist Party, have crushed the criminal activities of the remnants of the Muslim Brotherhood gang and the hopes the United States pinned on the activities of the criminal agents and the psychological warfare it conceived, prepared and executed to undermine Syria and reduce the effect of a Syrian diplomatic victory and a bitter U.S. and Israeli defeat in the UN General Assembly.

The Syrian masses are always ready and capable of destroying every black reactionary agent movement instigated by the United States and Israel through treacherous traitors. The internal Syrian front will remain strong, firm, solid and steadfast so that it cannot be overtaken or rendered a piece of paper in the hands of the enemies of Syria and the Arab nation. Syria shall remain a rock on which hostile conspiracies and maneuvers founder. Syria shall remain a source of permanent strength for the progressive national and pan-Arab policy of President Hafiz al-Asad, defending the legitimate rights of Syria and the Arab nation.

Though hostile U.S. stands could not undermine Syria, they are bound to leave a mark on U.S.-Syrian relations in particular and on U.S.-Arab relations in general. The problem with U.S. policy in the Arab world is not due to the Arabs or Syrians but to the fact that the United States does not have a policy in the Middle East and the fact that it speaks for Israeli policy in this sensitive part of the world. Examples are numerous. The whole world knows that were it not for U.S. political, military, economic and cultural aid, Israel would not have been capable of committing aggression, occupying other peoples' territories or expanding in Arab Palestine and neighboring Arab territories.

Arab-U.S. relations cannot but be affected by this hostile U.S. policy. Improvement of relations with the United States depends strictly on the U.S. attitude and the ability of the U.S. Government to rid itself of Zionist influence and commitment to Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy, which contravenes the UN Charter, international law and international norms.

BA'THISTS, GREEK COMMUNISTS HOLD TALKS

JN041906 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1615 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] A talk session was held at the Ba'th Party National Command building this morning between the Ba'th Party delegation headed by Comrade Muhammad Haydar, National Command member and chief of the Foreign Relations Bureau, and the Greek Communist Party delegation headed by party Secretary General Charilaos Florakis. During these talks, views were exchanged on issues of interest to the two parties and their joint struggle, particularly the tense Middle East situation resulting from practices of world imperialism and international Zionism against the Arab people, the Zionist entity's continued occupation of Arab territories and its expansionist policy and the unlimited U.S. support to the Zionist entity.

The two sides condemned all the capitulatory solutions in the region, solutions tributary to the capitulationist Camp David canal. The two sides stressed that a just solution in the region can only be based on Israel's complete withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories and ensuring the rights of the Palestinian Arab people's to return, to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent state on their national soil under the PLO, their sole legitimate representative.

The Greek delegation arrived in Damascus early today on a visit to Syria at the invitation of the Ba'th Party National Command in implementation of the joint cooperation agreement between the two parties.

Al-Ahmar Receives Delegation

JN042050 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1915 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Comrade 'Abdallah al-Ahmar, assistant secretary general of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party, received this evening the Greek Communist Party delegation headed by party Secretary General Charilaos Florakis. During the meeting they reviewed the relations of friendship and cooperation between the two parties and means of promoting these relations. Views were exchanged on the Middle East and on imperialist-Zionist moves. Comrade al-Ahmar explained the nature of the struggle waged by the Arab nation against the imperialist-Zionist-reactionary onslaught and the designs aimed at breaking Syria's steadfastness; reimposing U.S. hegemony through supporting Israel's aggressive and expansionist policy; bringing pressure to bear militarily, politically and economically; and instigating agents from the Muslim Brotherhood gang.

Comrade al-Ahmar explained the colonialist, racist and settlement nature of Zionism and its annexation and Judaization of Arab territories, the latest being the annexation of the Syrian Arab Golan Heights. Al-Ahmar stressed that our people will heroically, under the leadership of President Hafiz al-Asad, face all plots and annihilate the imperialist schemes. Our people, he added, will continue their just struggle supported by the forces of freedom and socialism headed by the friendly Soviet Union until the Arab territories are liberated and the Palestinian people's inalienable rights are restored.

Comrade al-Ahmar saluted the Greek people's struggle against the U.S. pacts and bases and declared our people's support for this struggle. He praised the Greek Government's support for justice and right in condemning Israel and imposing sanctions against it because of its annexation of the Golan.

Comrade Florakis expressed his party's appreciation for Syria's role in foiling the imperialist-Zionist-reactionary plots and schemes. He expressed the Greek people's support for the Arab causes headed by the cause of liberating Arab territories and restoring the inalienable Palestinian people's rights for the sake of a just peace and progress.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Comrade al-Ahmar thanked the head of the delegation and wished the Greek Communist Party and people further progress and victory.

KNESSET HOLDS SESSION IN HONOR OF MITTERRAND

Savidor Speech

TA041045 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0920 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Address by Knesset Speaker Menahem Savidor at the 4 March opening of a special Knesset session in honor of visiting French President Francois Mitterrand -- live]

[Text] Mr President of the Republic of France, my colleague members of the Knesset: Permit me to welcome heartily the distinguished guest in his own language. [Begin French passage] I am happy and privileged to welcome you among us, President of the French Republic and Mrs Mitterrand, and wish you a pleasant and fruitful stay. [end French passage]

This house, the bastion of democracy and sovereignty of all strata of the people, welcomes our guest enthusiastically, out of deep respect for his homeland, the bearer of the banner of revolution, emancipation and universality; out of respect for its language which symbolizes a culture encompassing the world; and out of the respect we all feel toward Mr Mitterrand personally as a courageous statesman faithful to principles.

We are well aware of the deep respect the president cherishes for our 100-year-old campaign, an enterprise motivated by national sentiments, 2000-year-old longings, and a desire to establish a society based on values of justice. This mutual respect is what brings our hearts closer and creates friendship between us.

I was deeply impressed with the two speeches the president made yesterday and with the exchange of views that took place across the table last night. I gather from them that our honorable guest has indeed adopted the doctrine of Jean Jaures, who acted out of moral, principled motivations and the general tradition of cultured humanity, while demonstrating courage -- as the great socialist leader demonstrated during the Dreyfuss affair. If this is really so, we are all, all Knesset members, permitted to expect a very significant turn both in France and in West Europe to be manifest by abandoning the way of humiliation, or what is termed in France "deshoneur," and the betraying, or what is called in French "desertion," of a faithful ally, namely Israel.

In view of the dialogue the president will hold with Israeli leaders, I will permit myself to voice some of the thoughts that have crossed my mind during the president's visit. First, concern. There are too many parts of the world where liberty is regressing, both because sophisticated tools of enslavement are abundant, and they are likewise widely used with cynicism, and also because the defenders of liberty throughout the world are deserting whether because of fatigue and dispair or out of an erroneous strategic approach, short-sighted mercantile considerations, and -- ironically -- because this serious cruel world, gripped by hatred and falsehood -- which are twins -- are turning our people, who for 2,000 years served as a symbol of persecution and suffering and were the victim of racism, into a conqueror, a racist people, an oppressor.

The country which has sacrificed on the altar of peace enormous strategic and economic assets has come to be called a warmonger. Human culture and liberty are founded on truth, while tyranny grows and is eternalized through falsehood. And from this, to yet a second thought: Thanks to the development of this sparsely populated country, and because a barren desert and rocky hills and swamps have been turned into a blooming garden, we have attracted to it hundreds of thousands of Arabs from neighboring countries.

In this context, I will make do, Mr President, with citing a quote from a memorandum by President Roosevelt to Secretary of State Cordell Hull of 17 May 1939, and I will also give you the number, 457-58, and I quote: The Arab immigration into Palestine since 1921 was very much greater than the sum of Jewish immigration during the same period of time.

Indeed, the glorious enterprise we have set up in this country with the sweat and blood of four generations of pioneers, defenders and fighters not only set up an infrastructure for our independence, but also brought progress to our neighbors and to the entire region. We expect that prevarication will employ the privilege it is entitled to: namely, it itself will defeat those who are using it.

In 9 years we shall celebrate the 200th anniversary of emancipation, without which the movement of our revival would not have come to be, nor would this state exist. France also would have come out lacking without the sons of our people, Henri Bergson, Andre Maurois, Henri Bernstein, Christian Bernard, Raymond Aron, Andre Schwartz-Bart, Rene Cassin and numerous others who enriched the culture of France in every sphere.

On this festive occasion I mark, on your behalf, the contribution of France to our national survival in the pre-state era, in the form of political and moral assistance, aiding the immigration of Holocaust survivors in ships plying the seas illegally, supplying vital arms for our defense, and by technological cooperation that insured our supremacy in the region. And all these, Knesset members, overshadow the period of ebb that prevailed during the last decade. Mr President, you have the opportunity to secure your place in history as a courageous leader of stature, to say the whole truth, and transform France into a focal point that sheds light and influences Europe and the nations in our region towards advancing peace and social betterment. If physical power, a firmness of decision are integrated in the vision and moral values of your nation, then the grandeur of France will again shed light on the world. All this Mr President, we wish you.

Last night, I heard from Mrs Danielle Mitterrand that the presidential couple was particularly well acquainted with the philosopher and man of conscience, Albert Camus. And, hence, allow me to conclude my address with a source quotation: "Monsieur Le President, rien n'est donnee, rien n'est promis, mais toute est possible a qui accept d'entreprendre et risquer."

[Mr President, nothing is given, nothing is promised, but everything is possible for he who is willing to take a risk] Thank you.

Mitterrand Speech

LD041220 Paris Domestic Service in French 0934 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Speech by French President Francois Mitterrand at 4 March session of Knesset in Jerusalem -- live]

[Text] Prime Minister, ladies and gentlemen. On this first visit by a French head of state to the Israeli people here in their own land, I would like to say to you, Ladies and gentlemen, what an honor I feel to be your guest and to be able, from the tribune which symbolizes your democracy, to greet you here as representatives of this noble and proud people in both their unity and diversity. I thank you, Mr Speaker, for the words which you have just spoken.

You were right to recall that our countries had no need to wait for official ceremonies to hold one another in esteem, to understand one another, to recognize one another or to meet one another; history has, indeed, many times linked our efforts, assembled our hopes, united our destinies. During the last third of this century not only have innumerable personal ties been established between France and Israel, but also organizational and public ties.

Thus, from the very beginning France has viewed itself as one of the most constant defenders of your entry into the community of nations as an independent people, the master of its choices. Thus, France was one of the first to establish diplomatic relations with your young state, just before the Soviet Union and the United States of America, I think, in the rush to do so at the time. France went on to contribute -- as it had a duty to, but with the added and inestimable value of friendship -- to strengthen your presence on the world scene and to guarantee your security.

I am recalling these facts not for glory or to solicit gratitude. Israel first of all owes its existence to the courage of its (?sons), the labor of its people, and the fidelity to an ineradicable hope. But when it had to count its forces and its friends in order to accomplish the last stage, that of the right to be recognized on its recovered land, France -- ladies and gentlemen -- was at its side. Yes, the French people are a friend of the Israeli people. Still marked by the memories of past years and the cruel trials of the Jewish communities, the French people's hearts beat as one when the State of Israel was established. The Holocaust is, in French minds, inseparable from your rebirth. Since then, it has never stopped admiring the works that have also been signs of your vitality, of your faith in the future. From now on Israel lives. And we, France, will not spare [words indistinct] our efforts to ensure that its right to existence is universally recognized without ambiguity, and therefore, to ensure at the same time the recognition of its right to possess the means of this existence.

May I say now, out of concern for balance, what France, Europe and Western civilization -- to which we belong and which made us -- owe to the great (?impact) of the Jewish people throughout 3 milleniums and even more (words indistinct] where in the darkness of time appeared the light that still illuminates us.

But let us not count our respective merits. Of all this I would maintain that our relations are based on exchange, whether it is culture or the search for every [word indistinct] explanation of the world and oneself, the way of being and of life, of society organized around man and for man, and finally the primacy of reason which, because it is reason, knows where its power ends.

This justifies the need of our two peoples for one another. It is this need that has enabled them to spread [words indistinct] their common domain, whether it is in arts, letters, sciences, technology, economy, social rapports, or the cultural or spiritual dimensions that have always inspired the best of our action.

There were, you see, many reasons for me to respond to your invitation. But I would add this one: It was high time, after a long -- a very long -- absence, for France in the person of its highest representative, to return to its place among you. Seventy thousand French people live in Israel; our language is widely understood and used here; our embassies have a permanent dialogue, our governments exchange information and consult one another. And yet, our conversation which increasingly took the form of nice references to the past, ended up sounding like [word indistinct] of language, or figures of style.

We were hiding behind our friendship while pretending that we did not know each other any more. In short, it was becoming urgent for us to speak using the present tense, and this is what I am doing now. Let it be very clear to begin with, that when I address your compatriots whose hospitality pleases me, it is to tell them that it is up to those who live in this region of the world to debate, and if possible to settle, the affairs that concern them. Even if it could, France would not seek to serve as a substitute to the interested peoples, and to the international institutions when the latter have to express themselves. For France, it is a matter of principle: Peace, freedom and justice are not to be dealt with by proxy. Nor does France come here as a teacher of lessons, or as a distributor of praise. Finally, and I have repeated this several times, it does not present itself as a referee or as a mediator between the peoples and states which remain free, before anything else, of their own approaches.

But France is from the small number of countries which, by their position, their historical weight, their friendships, their interests, have long been designated as the traditional interlocutors of the peoples of the Near East. With most of them, France maintains active and good relations, and as a permament member of the United Nations Security Council, it is called upon to examine the causes and nature of the conflicts that divide them. It also deems itself accountable for peace.

When I decided to come here, objections were made to me that by this act I would be approving all aspects of your policy. But you were not asking me for so much! And for my part, I was surprised at this curious way of mixing up what is distinct. To what country would I dare to say that I approve of all that it does? To what country would I demand that it declare itself in agreement with me on everything?

Let us have, ladies and gentlemen, a simpler and more sound conception of our exchange. The aim of a state visit is usually to bring points of view closer -- and this assumes that they were different. And when it comes to allies or friends, this visit should make it possible to increase the range of convergences -- regarded as more important and always preferable to the inevitable divergences. It is therefore normal that, on behalf of France, I should have an opinion concerning the major problems of your region, and that I should make it known. But it must be accepted once and for all that I express this opinion in the context of respect for the fundamental rights of others, rights which force themselves upon me, and foremost of which -- it seems to me -- is everybody's unshakable right to live.

This right, ladies and gentlemen, is yours. It belongs to the people who surround you. Naturally, when I say this I am thinking of the Palestinians of Gaza and the West Bank, and I am thinking -- although the legal and political realities are not the same -- of the people of Lebanon.

But before I develop this theme, I would like to set out the reasons why I adopted standpoints in respect of Israel, which everyone knows have been challenged on various sides. Why, in 1947 and as a member of the government of my country, was I -- as you recalled yesterday Mr Prime Minister -- with Edouard Depreux, one of the two ministers of the time to plead for and to obtain asylum for the exodus? It was because I could not tolerate the fact of these men and women who sought liberty being chased away everywhere, being refused the right to be themselves by those who mouthed great words and great principles.

Why, in 1978, did I approve -- alone among the leaders of the major French political groups -- the Camp David agreement? It was because I thought that those who were at war also had the right to make peace and to come closer together to try to provide a solution to the Palestinian problem. Why, in 1980, did I regret that the Venice conference implicitly set aside the Camp David procedure in favor of comprehensive negotiations? It was because I preferred a peace which is made gradually to a peace which is not made at all, real negotiations to uncertain negotiations, without rejecting by that, naturally, an overall agreement in the end.

Why, as president of the Republic of France, did I in 1981 refuse to continue associating France with the trade boycott affecting Israel? It was because my rule is not to agree in any circumstance to any sort of discrimination against an honorable people. Why did I agree to France taking part in the neutral Sinai force? Because we are volunteers whenever it is appropriate to help a peace process. Why, lastly, did I accept the invitation from Messrs Navon and Begin to come to Israel in 1982? Thus, I come back to my starting point. There is no prohibition for France, when it is its duty to speak one and the same language at all times and everywhere.

This elaboration indicates to you the direction France is taking. Why did I hope that the Arab inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza should have a homeland?

Because one cannot ask anyone to renounce his identity or reply on their behalf to the question which arises. I repeat that it is for the Palestinians, as for other people, whatever their origin, to decide their own fate, on the sole condition that they set their rights in the context of respect for the rights of others, of respect for international law and of dialogue in place of violence.

It is not for me, any more than for any other, to settle who represents this people and who does not represent it. Let us take the PLO, for example, which speaks on behalf of the fighters. Can it hope to sit down at the negotiating table as long as it denies the main point, that is, Israel's right to exist and its right to the means of security? Dialogue implies the previous and mutual recognition of the other's right to existence, the previous and mutual renunciation of direct or indirect war. While it is understood that everyone will recover its freedom to act in the event of failure, dialogue implies that each party can fully exhaust its rights -- which for the Palestinians, as for the others, may mean at the appropriate time a state. France will approve what will be a dialogue or an approach to dialogue, just as it will watch with anxiety any unilateral action by one or the other side which will delay the hour of peace.

Likewise, no one can decide on the borders or the conditions which, on the basis of UN Resolution 242, will be imposed on the parties involved. This will be a matter for the negotiators and for them alone. No subject, whatever it is, should be excluded from the negotiations. Whatever it is, I propose on behalf of the vast majority of members of parliament that everything should be negotiable as you said Mr Prime Minister, right here, in addressing President as-Sadat on 20 November, 1977.

I do not know whether there is a solution to the Palestinian problem which is acceptable to all quarters, but no one doubts that there is a problem and, if it remains unsolved it will weigh heavily and tragically upon this region. I am not only speaking about it because I am obeying something which I believe to be my duty but also because world peace -- already so threatened -- sees new threats gathering in the upheavals of Europe, in the multiple conflicts in the Near and Middle East. Any lasting, local unsolved crisis, ladies and gentlemen, any regional crisis which lasts, attracts the big powers of the world which are seeking any opportunity to exercise their balance of power. Any local or regional crisis which lasts 1 day escapes from those who are part of it and into the hands of those who are stronger than they are.

We must not, however, forget the bilateral relations between our countries either. These relations can be discussed by the ministers who accompanied me and their counterparts. What has been happening since yesterday will show, through the warmth of your welcome, the clarity of our debates, the openness of our talks, the very tone of our language that these bilateral relations are to become even closer.

Addressing the parliament of this country and speaking on behalf of my country, I no longer want to keep silent about France's priorities: increasing unity of the European Community of which it is a member; a more coherent defensive Atlantic alliance; independence of decisions when its existence is threatened; the beacons France lights so that the Geneva talks on disarmament should succeed; its desire to say loudly to the East what it thinks about a system and actions which harm human rights, which harm the rights of the people; and at the same time, our desire to maintain all chances of a dialogue which, throughout centuries, has always allowed us to speak to the eastern part of Europe. I add to this my own concern about aims which today are concentrated to yield an audacious and realistic policy in relations between the industrialized north and the Third World. If one continues to reject both reform of the monetary system and to seek the means of developing the energy potential of the poor countries that possess no oil, if one continues to refuse to define a policy in support of the raw materials for those countries which live and develop by relying on only one of them, then, given that these countries are quite unable to overcome the speculation which befalls them, it is impossible to arrange plans for codevelopment from one year to the other between the countries I am talking about, the poor Third World and the industrialized countries.

To conclude, ladies and gentlemen, I notice I have not spoken about Jerusalem where, in fact, we are just now. The Bible has given me spiritual food in my childhood, as I said last night. Upon reading it I learned that Jerusalem -- in your language Orshalim, the land of unity and contradictions, eternal I hope, universal undoubtedly -- will inevitably one day be the place of gathering of separated brothers. In its fierce desire to survive, I am sure your people will know how to find in its spirit the resources of intelligence and courage which will change, for itself and for others, pain into joy and anxiety into hope. I know that for a number of us, our roads crossed many times, friendships were created. At this very moment I am addressing the parliament as a whole, the Knesset of the State of Israel. On behalf of France I trust the representatives of this people to ensure the future of Israel according to their ideals. Also allow me to say good luck to you, and no one knows better of what I am speaking, no one has suffered more than you have in centuries past or been faced with such struggles as today's. May the dispersed (?threads) of the Jewish culture and history come together at last and give an answer, and you must do it, (?to) the great Arab people, inheritor of the great civilization which has also formed you. [sentence as heard]

Even If I have to read this document very attentively before returning to my seat I shall say to you these simple words: [Follows greeting in Hebrew, followed by applause]

Shalom to you!

Begin Speech

TA041150 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1000 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Address by Prime Minister Menahem Begin at a 4 March special Knesset session in honor of visiting French President Francois Mitterrand -- live]

[Text] Mr Speaker, Mr President of the State of Israel, Mr President of the French Republic, ministers of the French Republic, members of the Israeli Cabinet, distinguished guests, my friends members of the Knesset:

This is the first time since the resumption of our independence that a French President has visited Eretz Yisra'el and Jerusalem, our eternal capital, and our democratic house of representatives. On this historical day there is no other choice but to return to the memories of our youth. My father and teacher taught me as a child to love and admire France. He would quote to us long passages from the well-known treatise by Emile Zola "J'Accuse." The terrible and tragic Dreyfus affair registered in the memories of many people in and outside France. This was an affair concerning an outbreak of anti-Semitism which still exists even if it is only latent. This is a contagious epidemic passed from one generation to another, maybe especially in countries where small children learn the shocking prayer that begins with the words: Let us pray for the sake of the hyprocritic Jew. A well-poisoning prayer which the celebrated Pope John XXIII absolutely abolished.

That is how the man who envisioned our state, a man the like of whom is born only once in a hundred years, Theodor Herzl, saw the Dreyfus affair, and in the wake of this affair he concluded that a Jewish state should be established in the historic homeland of our people. When Herzl heard aroused crowds crying death to the Jews in the capital of the civilized world, in the city of lights, Paris, he was shocked. He sat in his small hotel writing the pivotal book, "Der Judenstrat," while hearing the fluttering of the wings of history, and was entirely enraptured by his fateful creation.

Scores of years later, maybe owing to the fact that time heals all wounds or maybe because of the presistent inclination of the Jewish soul to forget the bad and to remember the good, the Dreyfus affair (?in the old house) which no longer exists was understood in a totally different way.

We regard it as the huge effort by the French people to do justice. Indeed, this was a great struggle between truth and falseness, between light and darkness, between love and hatred, between justice and injustice. Since I have no doubt that had our distinguished friend, Francois Mitterrand, lived in those days he would have courageously and typically cried out. Alongside Emile Zola, Clemenceau, Jaures, Labori, Colonel Picquart, I will today present to the Knesset the main facts about the triumph of justice within the great French nation.

On 23 December 1894, Alfred Dreyfus was sentenced to life imprisonment for treason and espionage. In March 1896, Colonel Picquart found the letter called petit bleu written to Esterhazy. In 1898, Emil Zola published "J'Accuse" against his government and his army and for the sake of his nation, the honor of his country and in the name of justice. On 9 September 1899, the sentence was passed in the second trial of the Dreyfus affair and he was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment. Ten days later he was pardoned by the French president. However, the seekers of justice did not rest because truth is not pardoned, truth wins. In 1903, a retrial was again demanded and in 1906 truth won and the sentence was entirely abolished. Twelve long years had passed since Dreyfus was convicted on the basis of false and falsified evidence and the French people did not rest until the justice of this man, this poor Jew, came to light. Indeed, truth is an absolute term and it acts outside, beyond and above time.

Mr Speaker, in time we learned about the events of the French Revolution. This is the only revolution in human history which brought freedom and progress not only to the French people but to many other nations. There are those who say the revolutionary war of the 13 American colonies that began in 1776 -- 13 years before the outbreak of the French Revolution in the wake of the takeover of the Bastille -- that is, that the American warriors preceded the French fighters. However, one must bear in mind the difference: A revolutionary freedom war was waged in North America against British rule which ended, thank God, with the victory of those fighting against an oppressive colonial rule. There were many similar wars. However, the French Revolution broke out against internal oppression; it called for freedom, equality and fraternity. It was a vast leap forward for all humanity. All other revolutions did nothing but bring increased slavery to humanity. I am mainly referring to the revolution of November 1917 in Russia. One must remember that the Russian people lived under an oppressive Tsarist regime for over 300 years and they enjoyed only 9 months of real freedom. In February 1917 the Tsarist regime fell and the Russian republic was established. Then, real freedom prevailed throughout Russia, even reaching the point of anarchy, when people lay on the railroad tracks.

The dream of freedom in Russia was soon over and the revolution launched by Lenin and his friends with the help of the closed train of the German Kaiser's army brought not only a new oppression, even worse than before, including the murder of millions by that infamous monster known as the iron man, Iosif Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili Stalin. This revolution of oppression spread in the wake of World War II [heckling by MK Me'ir Wilner of Hadash; the Knesset speaker asks him not to tarnish the festivity of this special session and calls him to order]

Mr President, I am happy that my colleague, MK Wilner, interrupted me. Now, I am sure he will not be able to stop you. As you see, in Israel even the communists are hospitable.

This revolution of oppression spread in the wake of [several words indistinct due to heckling] over half of Europe only with the help of Soviet tanks. The great French Revolution was entirely different, regarding which Thomas Carlyle wrote the second version of his famous book "The French Revolution," because the first manuscript was totally burned. He himself, historian and philosopher Carlyle, felt that the second manuscript even outdid its predecessor. Thomas Carlyle wrote the truth. He did not conceal the acts of horror that accompanied the French Revolution, and there were such acts.

However, he explained to succeeding generations the terrible harassment of the French people by a degenerate aristocratic minority which ruthlessly and cruelly oppressed and exploited them through the exercise of horrendous and atrocious sentences. The people rose up against oppression and in honor of the marching Marseilles revolutionaries, the great cry broke out: Aux Armes Citoyens, Formez Vos Bataillons [last six words in French]. Then the revolutionary army was established and it overpowered the aggressive invading armies of an antirevolutionary coalition. According to Carlyle, the French would then say: With a piece of bread, with a grain of salt and with the Marseilles -- we will go all the way to China.

Indeed, they did not reach China and even Napoleon was forced to withdraw from Moscow. Yet the song composed by Rouget de Lisle remains to this day the French national anthem in spite of its content, just as the song written by Imber, Hatiqva, is our national anthem to this day although we have long been a free people in our country and no longer can anyone speak about the last of the Jews. The same holds true about the Marseillaise, the song of freedom, the song of rebellion against oppression, the song of self-liberation of a suffering people. For all these reasons, Mr President, we have always loved and admired France, its history, its great language, its culture, its drive for justice, its willingness to fight for it.

I cannot conceal, Mr President, that in the relations between our people and France there were also black days, those of the Vichy regime and the turning over of our brethren to their German destroyers. However, darkness is followed by light. The French people supported our war of liberation against foreign rule and also helped us, not with words but with deeds, to overcome the attempt to destroy us on the day we resumed our independence.

There were also other days of light, when we were not just friends but also allies. The values of democracy made us true partners. Together we helped each other, we acted together, we withstood trials. These days also passed and were followed by very difficult days of estrangement, support for our enemies, moving away from us. Faithful are the wounds of a friend [Proverbs 27:6], said the wisest of men.

Mr President, we never stopped loving France but, to our regret, it was an unrequited love. There are grounds for hope that with the election of Mr Francois Mitterrand as president of the French Republic the situation will undergo a basic change.

I have known Mr Mitterrand since 1955, as I related last night in detail and as the president was kind to mention today in his speech. Since then we have met numerous times, always in a friendly and hearty manner. Mr Mitterrand has studied history and he knows the history of the Jewish people. He knows about their suffering throughout all the years in the Diaspora and he especially knows about their flight during the Holocaust. Therefore, I may see in the wake of our personal contacts that Mr Mitterrand is a friend of Israel and he will probably strive to revive the friendship and perhaps even the alliance between our peoples and countries.

However, I will not deny that there are also obstacles on this desirable path. It is my assessment -- and it is my duty to speak candidly -- that the main obstacle is the French support for the notion of a Palestinian state in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza. [heckling by unidentified Hadash Knesset member]

His excellency the French minister of external relations goes to one of the most advanced and democratic states in the world, Abu Dhabi, and to one of the peace-seeking countries in the world, Iraq. There, of all places, his excellency declares: first, that a Palestinian state should be established in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza; second, that the so-called PLO organization -- or OLP in French -- is the sole legitimate representative of the Arabs of Eretz Yisra'el, who live in Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza District, and that it should be incorporated into the peace process.

Mr Speaker, I will start my analysis with the second point. President Mitterrand knows well the contents of the document called the Palestinian Charter, which may certainly be described as the Arab edition of "Mein Kampf" concerning the Jewish people. However, today I will relate to you a dialogue held only a few days ago in London between the DAVAR correspondent and Mr Al-Hasan, Mr 'Arafat's assistant. This is what the full report of the dialogue stated:

Question: Let us assume that Israel withdrew from the territories. Would you make do with a Palestinian state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip? Al-Hasan replied: The problem is not geographical, it is political.

[Question] I am asking a political question. Would you make do with the West Bank and the Gaza Strip? Al-Hasan replied: Do you mean those few square kilometers?

Question: I mean the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Al-Hasan answered: No, we will strive for one Palestine to implement our entity.

Question: And what about the Zionist entity: Al-Hasan replied: Zionism is the Devil; we do not negotiate with it. Anyway, it will not survive for long.

Question: Still, there is also a state called Israel and it has boundaries, an emblem, a flag, people. Al-Hasan: If this state is based on the Zionist notion then it has no right to exist and we have no intention to negotiate with it.

Question: Still, you have recently been speaking only about the occupied territories, meaning the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Al-Hasan: True, we are now talking about territories as part of the implementation of the idea.

Question: In other words, you are talking about the secular and democratic state mentioned in the Palestinian Charter. Al-Hasan: True, I am talking about that state.

Question: Then, it is the same old story we have been hearing for a long time. Al-Hasan: True, it is exactly the same old story.

Mr Speaker, in light of such a dialogue I would like to know [heckling by MK Tufiq Tubi] why the full autonomy we are proposing to the Arab inhabitants in Judaea, Samaria and the Gazadistrict according to the Camp David accords is out of the question. In a document we presented a few weeks ago to the U.S. and Egyptian Governments, and to his excellency, the president of the French Republic yesterday, we proposed that the self-governing authority -- the administrative council -- be granted the following authority: 1. laws; 2. agriculture; 3. finance; 4. civilian service; 5. education and culture; 6. health; 7. housing and public works; 8. transportation and communications; 9. work and welfare; 10. local authorities; 11. local police; 12. religious affairs; 13. industry, trade and tourism.

When this administrative council is established -- following its democratic election -- and begins functioning, we will withdraw the military government. These will constitute historical changes in the life of the Arab inhabitants of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza. For the first time they will have an elected representation which will freely handle, without any intervention on our part, its daily afffairs. The Military Government will withdraw. A similar situation did not exist in the days of Turkish, British, Jordanian or Egyptian rule. Why is this idea out of the question and why are some of your advisers, Mr President, pointedly urging the establishment of a Palestinian state?

It is my duty today to explain, to you as well, the meaning of a Palestinian state in Judaea, Samaria and Gaza as far as the Jewish state is concerned. This state would be established on the mountains and hills of Samaria and Judaea.

The PLO has lots of Soviet weapons, tanks, cannons, Katyusha rockets. The range of the Soviet 130-mm cannon, an excellent cannon, is 27 km; the range of the Katyusha rockets is 21.6 km. Along the coastal plain by the Mediterranean Sea live 2/3 of the Jewish population: There are 8 miles or 13 km between the seashore and the former green line. From any point on the Samaria and Judaea mountains it is possible to reach Petah Tiqva, Ramat Gan, Bene Beraq, Giv'atayim, Tel Aviv, Yafo and other places with these weapons, with the sophisticated weapons possessed by the terrorists who seek our destruction.

Can France, peace-seeking France, support the horrendous idea of creating such a menace to the very existence of our people, to the very existence of our people? I have heard an opinion according to which it would be symetrically just if alongside the Jewish state a Palestinian state were also established. No, sir, there is neither symmetry nor justice here. Symmetry? The large Arab nation today has 21 sovereign states stretching across an area of 12 million square kilometers, from the Persian Gulf to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean. The Jewish people, who were not only persecuted but also destroyed, have a minute and sole state in their ancient motherland. Is it necessary to establish a 22nd Arab state which will strive to annihilate the Jewish state, which will shed the blood of its citizens day and night? This is asymmetry. [heckling by MK Tubi; the Knesset speaker urges him to calm down]

Thank you, Mr Speaker. This is asymmetry. And where is justice? Can the French people afford, in light of what happened in World War II, to support the idea of handing the (?mountains) of Judaea and Samaria to a destructive enemy, as it describes itself in the infamous charter and in all its conventions, including the latest Fatah convention in Damascus?

Mr President, I deliberately ask these questions rhetorically and do not expect a reply to them. Let these questions reverberate not only in the Knesset hall but also in the hall of the National Assembly in Paris. Let these questions reverberate on the French radio and television stations, on the editorial boards and, if I may say so, in the Elysee Palace where our dear friend, Francois Mitterrand, the president of the French Republic resides.

I would like to express our belief that in this case, too, justice will win and truth will emerge and the decisive obstacle in the path of friendship between France and Israel which we cherish so much may be removed.

Mr President of the Republic of France, our dear friend, I would like today to entrust to your hands a certain idea which transcends the boundaries of our country. I am proposing that you undertake action for the signing of a Mediterranean charter. My suggestion is that all the nations living along the Mediterranean coasts, from the north and the south, from the east and the west, members of the three monotheistic faiths: Judaism, Christianity and Islam, sign a joint charter whose principles will be the following: A) None of these nations will initiate war against another; B) any conflict between them will be resolved through negotiations; C) war will no longer serve as their political tool.

You must surely have noticed, Mr President, that this reflects the spirit of the Locarno Pact, the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Atlantic Charter. It is an honor for me to admit this. I did not use the precise wording of the Locarno Pact, which stipulates a mutual commitment not to attack, not to invade, not to launch war except in the case of legitimate national defense or, in other words, that the use of this right of self-defense also allows a counterattack and an invasion of the aggressor. We have learned from experience that there is no need to stipulate this exception to the rule if we write that no country will initiate war against another. In other words, clearly if a country is attacked, it has every right to national self-defense, as also stated in Article 51 of the UN Charter.

The concept of not allowing war to be a political tool was taken from the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which unfortunately was to no avail to humanity when the National Socialist tyranny took control of the heart of Europe.

Two pacts were signed with the satanic aggressor: one in September 1938 and another in August 1939, and neither prevented the course of bloodshed, once in the West, another time in the East. But this does not mean the idea itself failed; the people failed, leaders were blinded and nations were misled -- but the concept itself was right and great. Let us not hesitate to go back to it and try to realize it today.

Please, Mr President, take the initiative. Why do you not approach all the nations in the region, which is the cradle of human culture, and suggest to them -- with the amendments you see fit to introduce -- this Mediterranean charter?

These days our world is divided into many categories: into democracies and totalitarian regimes; North and South; satisfied nations and hungry ones; industrialized countries and developing countries; countries where their citizens have peace and countries where bloody internal war rages. Let us try to bring about another division of the world: a division of the world into regions of peace. Let a Mediterranean peace tone be established! Let there be an Atlantic peace zone, and also one in the Baltic region, in the Pacific area and elsewhere. By establishing such peace regions, the well-being of the human race will be established, perhaps even guaranteed, in the days when the horrible danger of mutual extermination is lurking above our heads.

Thank you, distinguished guest, for having been so kind as to deliver your speech to the Knesset. May you be welcome upon arrival in the historic homeland of the Jewish people and in Jerusalem, the city of David, our eternal capital. Together with you, may your wife and honorable aides be also welcome. Our hospitable nation is opening its heart to you, and when you return to your homeland and home, please tell your great people: The people of Israel continue to love and respect France, the country that coined the motto: liberte, egalite, fraternite; whose real, ancient source is the Bible.

Tell them, your people, Mr President, that the time has come to renew the friendship and the alliance on both sides of the Mediterranean -- between France and Israel.

Thank you very much. [applause]

Peres Speech

TA041240 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1031 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Address by Labor Party Chairman MK Shim'on Peres at the Knesset, immediately following the speech by Prime Minister Menahem Begin on the occasion of the special Knesset session held in honor of visiting French President Francois Mitterrand -- live]

[Text] Mr Speaker, Monsieur le President, chers amis, Mr President of the State of Israel, Knesset Members, guests: I am not sure this is the time to conduct a full political debate, nor will I conceal the fact that when I speak today on behalf of the opposition, I cannot find in me an opposition spirit. I am talking as a man bearing in his mind irradicable memories of a golden age in the relations between France and Israel. I am talking as a Jew who has felt the overwhelming spiritual strength of revolutionary France, as a Zionist socialist who has been nurtured even from his very infancy from the sources of French socialism -- socialism which has turned mutiny into a culture and a revolution into a great human aspiration and hope. Finally, I am talking as a man who has known Francois Mitterrand to be one of the greatest sons of France, as a leader with an international sense of duty and responsibility, as the leader of the Socialists in his country and as a deep and sincere friend of the Jewish people and its country, Israel.

Mr Speaker, our ties with the new France began taking shape even before we became a state, when the boats carrying our illegal immigrants, bearing the burning embers and last remnants of the Nazi hell sought a shore from which to sail on to their homeland and found it in Marseilles. These relations reached a dramatic peak after our war of independence in the early 1950's. Israel, fighting then for its life, Israel which had just emerged from the test of war, looked at the outside world with amazement: How did it come to be that countries that voted for the establishment of the State of Israel prevented it from having the guns it needed for its defense? How did it happen that as the fighting subsided, but when dangers still remained, again an embargo was imposed on it, while the arms nonetheless continued to flow into the aggressor's hands?

In vain did we knock on the gates of Moscow and Washington. The main entrances were blocked to us, and the back doors could not help. Between the cannon fire, which had just stopped and the refugee boats that just then began arriving, Israel shivered in the face of the strange combination of good wishes in theory, and actual cold-shouldering. We then reached out to France. France, still recovering from the injuries of war, France which overcame its traditional divisions between the rich and the poor, monarchists and republicans, between the clergy and the lay population, France then was united and divided according to a new characteristic: The France of the Maquis movement, bearing hope, and the France of Vichy, carrying the badge of regret.

We discovered that great country under the leadership of a new generation that had just emerged from the underground basements and the prisoner and concentration camps, from the battle with the Nazis. We saw before us leaders who pledged to prevent, at all costs, the return of the Nazi shame, or the appearance of a similar organization. We knocked on the door of France, and it opened without any of the normal diplomatic formalities. Out of it came forth a warm wave of sympathy toward the crippled Jewish people, and through it one could see sincere bright faces shining toward the State of Israel.

Relations began to take shape. The government of Mendes-France, in which Francois Mitterrand could be numbered as a young, promising minister, made a gesture when it granted the honorary legion award publicly to the late Moshe Dayan. I myself came at the same time with a letter by the first Israeli prime minister, the founder of the State of Israel, David Ben-Gurion, to Rue St Dominique, and was received with friendliness by the hero of Bir Hacheim and a great friend of our nation, General Koenig. He was then defense minister. It was on a Sunday, and it also opened the first page in a unique book.

Since then, I returned countless times to the French capital, and could bring home positive answers -- almost the only positive responses we got in the whole world -- from Guy Mollet, Edgar Faure, (Bourget Monoris), and General de Gaulle. But it was not only the arms that we got -- and arms to a people under siege is like water to soil in times of a drought -- but also the attitude we encountered in France: a spontaneous, deep and almost caressing [mefaneq] attitude given by the entire French nation -- its institutions, its parties, its newspapers, by men of letters and men of sword, by laborers, philosophers and writers. This was a heartwarming demonstration toward our tiny country -- the only country the Jewish people have: Israel that is rejuvenating itself, democratic and pioneering Israel.

I know of no other example of relations that were so close, so warm and so informal as those that developed between France and Israel between 1954 and 1967. They carried the force of a great spirit, were a good precedent and bore the fruit of sincere responsiveness.

Mr President, we will remember these relations with deep gratitude, created when a nation was fighting for its life. We will remember this aid, which allowed us to crush budding dangers, gain sovereignty and maintain our independence in judgment and in deed. France, which honored a free Israel, helped it to be more independent.

Knesset Members, these relations also had an historic depth. Napoleon, who wanted to revive the Sanhedrin, directed his interior minister in the following words: This is the first time since Titus conquered Jerusalem that such a large number of enlightened people, members of the Mosaic faith, have been gathered without imposing on them a demand that they convert, or surrender to changes that conflict with the Jewish faith -- in letter or spirit. end of quote.

The French Revolution enlightened fanatic Europe with a light of hope whose rays reached the homes of millions of Jews persecuted for no cause, bringing them hope. Ten days after the French Commune was established in 1882, Tsarist Russia also opened up, and the Zionist movement launched its great journey, the centennial of which we have just marked.

Mr Speaker, the French socialism which Louis Blanc began in 1848 with very modest success -- all in all they elected one delegate to the National Assembly -- began attracting tens of thousands of Frenchmen, and that socialism very quickly divorced itself from that which was doctrinaire and from violence, assuming instead the form of a new humanitarian culture. As Jean Jaures called it, this was socialism that changed from the law into thirst, from a mechanical law into a craving for justice. That socialism encountered a test during the Dreyfus trial, gearing up for war against injustice and a struggle against the bias called anti-Semitism. The great sons of France, among them Emile Zola, Georges Clemenceau, Romain Rolland, Jean Jaurer, Leon Blum, all enlisted in this battlefront. Among those who listened to Jean Jaures' great speech on the Dreyfus trial at the French parliament was also a young, enthusiastic journalist who described Jaures as an ardent leader of a human expeditionary force. This journalist was Theodor Herzl. He left the Dreyfus trial and the first draft of "Der Judenstaat" was already inscribed in his heart. Ever since, French socialism was viewed as a call for all wars against inequality and every case of human deprivation -- or a Leon Blum put it: Socialism was born from the conscience of equality. [last phrase in French]

That socialism made a deep impression on the fathers of our movement, the Labor movement, and the spiritual teacher of our movement, Berl Katzenelson, told me he found in Jaures' pathos a resounding echo of the demand of the prophets of Israel for social justice, for universal peace.

Francois Mitterrand, who confessed in his book and today, that the Bible nurtured him since infancy [last phrase in French], that the Bible nurtured my childhood, left prison to carry the banner of free France, flown by General de Gaulle. He stood by him in liberating France and opposed him in attempting to change France and turn it into a country of such values where money dictates man's destiny; into a society where people toil out of harmony in a bid to divide equally the citizens' efforts and fruit of their labor. I saw him in those struggles from close by, as a friend, as a pal. At times he seemed to be lonely. Sometimes he appeared to be a loser, but he never looked desperate. Throughout 12 years he led his minority party through the harsh political desert until he turned it into a mass party and enjoyed the full mandate accorded him by his nation, and he did this without use of violence -- physical or verbal. He revived in France the spirit of freedom and brotherhood, but this time through the gates of pure democracy, in broad daylight, as the new morning the citizens wanted. He became a leader pursuing his own course. He saw the great battle of our times not only in the power struggle between the two large superpowers -- in the Western and Eastern poles -- but as a drama taking place between the two worlds: The world of affluence and the world of hunger -- the alluence of the North and the hunger of the South; between a world enjoying the advantage of progress and the world affected by the yoke of oppression, both externally and internally.

A division into classes exists among the nations and not only within them.

In this context, he held many talks about the Middle East and of course about Israel. Francois Mitterrand visited us six times. Even when he was an official guest he eschewed formality and preferred to tour the country incognito, the kibbutzim, moshavim, cities and villages.

He preferred direct contacts with Jews, Arabs and Druze. He developed a deep understanding of the pioneering spirit of socialist Zionism. I was able to learn both about his personal feelings and his public positions. Together we made our way through 150,000 Jews who gathered at the Palais de la Defense in Paris in a huge and emotional demonstration for Israel, to salute the Jewish state. From all sides there were cries of long live Israel! Long live Mitterrand! After we had made our way through the crowd, Mitterrand emotionally asked me: Where else in the world is there another people who love their country so much?

We appeared together at the opening of the convention of the socialist Zionist movement in France and Mitterrand told the audience: If one recognizes the right of the Jewish people to exist, it should not be denied the necessary means to defend its people and its rights. We held a lengthy talk at the meeting of the Socialist International in Madrid in 1980. I expressed to him our concern about the supply of military uranium to Iraq. He promised something which he also fulfilled in his public statements during the election campaign and which I am also certain that he will fulfill in the future, that is, not to supply such dangerous uranium to Iraq or to a country that may use it for this purpose. He supported the appeal made by the Madrid convention to Jordan -- Butrus Ghali also attended this convention on behalf of Egypt -- to join the negotiations on peace in order to create a Jordanian-Palestinian framework within which it would be possible to solve the Palestinian problem and to assure Israel secure borders. I realized that he is open to any solution; he told me he was opposed to any imposed solution.

After the elections we also met, this time at the Elysee Palace of the Socialist president. He remained loyal to his policy. Unlike others, he openly reiterated his support for the Camp David accords -- just as he did today from the Knesset podium. Unlike his predecessors, he has not embraced a specific solution but is looking for an acceptable solution to the parties involved in the conflict. He knows that the obstacles cannot be overcome in one leap and that there is room and need for patience, for adopting a step-by-step approach in order to reach either an interim solution or partial progress -- and he reiterated this at the Knesset today. He abstained from depicting Jerusalem as an Arab city or as a city likely to be partitioned. He reiterated the two-fold need not only to guarantee Israel's security but also the means necessary for maintaining its security, through open relations among equals. This visit also fits into this framework.

We have also had differences of opinion. In my opinion -- so I understood -- he does not regard the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinians but believes that the PLO should not be ruled out of the negotiations. There are differences of opinion but they have not shortcircuited our dialogue. If such a dialogue can be conducted, it is also possible to reach greater understanding. For my part, I explained to him that the PLO has been the tragedy of the Palestinians because of its extremism, that the PLO poses a threat to Israel through its charter, and that the right to self-determination is only possible in an atmosphere of real democracy and not under the shadow of murderous terror. Just as the Soviet tanks undermine the right to self-determination of the Poles, so do the Kalachnikov rifles of 'Arafat undermine the chances of free choice of the Palestinians.

[Heckling by MK Tubi]

MK Tubi, there was no occupation; Jordan attacked Israel without any provocation, it unnecessarily threatened our security. The Israeli prime minister, Levi Eshkol, appealed to Husayn and told him: Stay where you are, do not attack us, we will not hurt you; in spite of the fact that he was sitting in Jerusalem. What occupation are you talking about? Who are you telling this, to this house? [Heckling by various Knesset Members, the speaker calls for order]

Mitterrand told me -- and this is evident -- that France does not have to sever its relations with the Arab world. We are for maintaining these relationships for the sake of peace.

However, he also told me that France would not make a move that would endanger Israel's security or that would impose an unacceptable opinion on it.

I believe that this policy of Francois Mitterrand, just as his visit to Israel, will bring a distinguished and new status to France, both in Israeli and Arab public opinion since all of us harbor genuine respect for whoever states his opinion with courage and sincerity and whose words do not change as he moves from one place to another. I estimate that just as we openly appreciate those standing by the effort to pave a road to peace, there is hidden appreciation in the Arab world toward whoever wants to settle the conflict rather than exploit it.

Mr Speaker, we, the Alignment representatives, are convinced of the justness of Zionism, of the victory of socialism, of the strength of democracy and of the belief that peace is inevitable. In our eyes, Zionism is the liberation of the Jewish people from depending on the favors of strangers and it is also a commitment to abstain from one people ruling another. We do not want to force 1.3 million Arabs to live under our rule against their will and neither do we want to establish a binational state where hostility and disputes will prevail forever between our nations. This is our choice, no one else's choice.

In our view, Zionism not only means the gathering of the Jewish people in its motherland but changing the structure of its way of life and existence. We do not want the members of one or another peoples to work for us, to serve us or to defend us. The liberation from the Diaspora and its effects means the building of a Jewish people who live by their own work and thoughts, are independent in their judgment, a people capable of defending themselves and their country. Our socialism is a universal vision which the prophet Isaiah described well in a few sentences: To turn aside the needy from justice and to rob the poor of my people of their right [Isaiah 10:2] and nation shall not lift up sword against nation [Isaiah 2:4].

Just as you, Mr President, we believe that freedom entails responsibility and that equality is the expression of the aspiration for social justice. In relationships among men and in relationships among nations, equality is the expression of justice. This is a vision emerging from generations past, a vision to which there is no other alternative in generations to come. We aspire to peace in the Middle East.

Mr President, tell your people -- I am certain I say this on behalf of this entire house: There is no hatred in our hearts toward the Arabs, we are not indifferent to the human fate of other nations, Arabs, Druze, Egyptians, Palestinians and Jordanians. As did Leon Blum, we believe that peace will not be determined through victory but victory will be determined through peace. We believe that consideration should be given to the feelings of all peoples and to their real needs. When a contradiction emerges between different needs, the Arabs as well as we must seek a respectable compromise, not just we. In our opinion, the real solution lies in expanding the peace front and in the participation of the Jordanians and the Palestinian representatives living in the territories at the negotiating table around which Israel and Egypt are already seated. Israel and Egypt, I am confident, will continue the peace process.

A Jordan that would turn toward a military confrontation would pose a threat to Israel but a Jordan dangerous to Israel would also be a Jordan dangerous to itself. A Jordan that would turn to peace would find the border stretching between us as a surprising opportunity for cooperation. It has been said that the Jordan River is richer in history than in water -- and there is still room to make history around it. Such a Jordan would find us ready to cooperate on making economic progress, on solving the Palestinian problem.

We call on the Palestinian leaders in the territories to turn from the imaginary charms of the past and undertake the risk involved in negotiations. It is a risk, but it is the only risk entailing a chance.

Mr President, we believe that France under your leadership can contribute a great deal to advancing peace in our region. I am not sure whether the entire region can be recruited, but I am sure that it is within your power to contribute to creating a climate where peace constitutes the chief option. Such a France may steer Europe from toying with formulations to a great historical partnership between the European Continent and the Mediterranean region. A united and constructive Europe can help this region to rehabilitate itself, to give itself an opportunity similar to the one given to Europe after World War II. Such a Europe can assist in raising the standard of living of all the peoples in the region, to redeem the needy from their poverty, the oppressed from oppression, the extremists from their blindness.

Finally, Mr President, we hope that your visit here will open a new page in the historical relationship between our two nations, between the Republic of France and the State of Israel, between the French and Jewish peoples. This time we are not striving toward a specific field of cooperation but rather to the larger area where the spirit of one nation meets the spirit of the other nation, where culture, science and economy unite to break into new horizons for mutual creativity, for a new creation.

Your visit here, in united Jerusalem, a Jerusalem that lies at the heart of history and that is history itself in the hearts of all of us; your visit here, Mr President, is not an ordinary diplomatic act. It enables a return to the initial situation in the relations between our nations, to a situation where dreams, vision, friendship and hope break through habit and routine.

I know that you like the poems of St John Perse. Therefore, I will conclude by quoting one line: I saw a country stretched over immense fields and I could not help thinking of the nomad. [last phrase in French]

Long live France, long live Israel, long live friendship between France and Israel. [Peres repeats the same phrase in French; applause]

PERES DESCRIBES PRIVATE MEETING WITH MITTERRAND

TA041646 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1510 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] There were some more events during the French president's visit. He ate breakfast in the company of Labor Party Chairman Shim'on Peres. Our correspondent Gil'ad Mishori heard about the topic of the talk from MK Peres.

[Begin recording] [Peres] He himself is not tied to any specific solution. Any solution that can be adopted without, of course, imposition, is a solution he will support. This is because he is looking for a solution, he is not looking for a specific solution.

[Question] Including a solution called autonomy?

[Answer] Including a solution called autonomy, although I am not certain that there is much certainty that autonomy will really be implemented. The problem with autonomy is not its negative aspect, but how realistic a proposal it is. That is the real problem, in my opinion, about autonomy.

[Question] Mitterrand said that -- superficially -- that the European initiative does not, in fact, exist. What does this statement mean, in your view?

[Answer] The matter of the European initiative is that Europe committed itself to several formulations that Israel does not accept. It is in favor of a solution, but it is against an imposed solution, it does not think that anyone has to impose on Israel, or on others -- I am not only saying, on Israel -- to impose a solution. The fact that it is a most important opening, I have no doubt of this; I formed the impression that the French side too was very moved.

The president himself is very moved and, of course, he is cautious in his public statements, but in the private talk, he was certainly moved. [end recording]

BEGIN EXPLAINS LEBANON POLICY TO MITTERRAND

TA041625 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1600 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] At a luncheon, Begin told Mitterrand that Israel will not attack Lebanon unless attacked. He also said Israel will never allow another holocaust to befall the Lebanese Christians. The prime minister emphasized that there are 20,000 terrorists in Lebanon and 40,000 Syrian troops sheltered by an aerial umbrella of antiaircraft missiles.

'CIRCLES' REACT TO MITTERRAND KNESSET SPEECH

TA041540 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1510 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Report by political correspondent Gad Becker from the prime minister's office -- live]

[Excerpt] Let us now go on to today, the second day of Mitterrand's visit to Jerusalem. Jerusalem was not surprised by Francois Mitterrand's remarks in the Knesset about the Palestinian problem, about the need to establish a state for the Palestinians. President Mitterrand, by the way, spoke about this yesterday with the prime minister and, as Foreign Minister Shamir told us, this is a part of the visit, it was impossible to avoid it. The prime minister hopes that his remarks and reasoning against a Palestinian state will now be heard in France and perhaps have some influence on public opinion there. Beyond the assessment that Francois Mitterrand's call in the Knesset for the establishment of a Palestinian state will help to further the trend toward polarization already in existence in the Arab world on this issue, Jerusalem is passing over these remarks easily. They had been expected and apparently will not prevent a continuation of the development of relations between France and Israel.

As for the working luncheon that ended here in the prime minister's office less than an hour ago, the main topic discussed was the situation in Lebanon. The prime minister presented Israel's position in detail. Together with the head of the IDF intelligence branch, Major General Sagi, he pointed to the Syrian conquest of Lebanon and the danger to the Christian minority there. He explained why Israel is supplying arms to the Christians in Lebanon and he expressed the hope that the cease-fire will continue forever, although he at once added: It is doubtful if such an assumption is possible. It appears then that Israel is interested in incorporating France in the political action in Lebanon. Help for the Christians of Lebanon, Mr Begin said to Mitterrand, is a thoroughly humanitarian mission about which there cannot be any doubts. It was agreed -- that issue has not yet been presented -- it was agreed that the defense minister will meet this evening already, in Jerusalem, with two of the French president's senior aides for a continuation of the discussion, to provide further explanations on this sensitive issue of Lebanon. The concluding talk between President Mitterrand and the prime minister began, as I said, only a few minutes ago; after that the pair will come out from here to a joint news conference in the press center that was established in the Jerusalem Plaza Hotel.

BEGIN, FRENCH PRESIDENT HOLD NEWS CONFERENCE

TA041745 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1625 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Joint news conference held in Jerusalem Plaza Hotel by French President Francois Mitterrand and Prime Minister Menahem Begin -- live; all Mitterrand remarks rendered in French and all Begin remarks, all rendered in English, are processed from the superimposed Hebrew translation]

[Text] [Question -- in English] President of France, Mr Mitterrand, my French is not as good as the prime minister's I'm afraid.

The question is: You have spent 2 days now with Prime Minister Begin giving you his government's attitude toward autonomy and toward what he sees as the danger of a Palestinian state to Israel. Have you been convinced by the prime minister, has this in any way changed your point of view [words indistinct] when you arrived?

[Mitterrand] One cannot say that I have spent 2 days with him. You said that I had spent 2 days with the prime minister. We spent many long minutes together in the course of those 2 days, long enough to discuss some things in depth, and still I would not like to repeat the discussions, the talks in real depth because this will take far too long. I have said things in the Knesset around noontime, and have not changed my mind since. Between 1300 this afternoon and 1800 my opinion has not changed, even if a dialogue with the Israeli prime minister is good and interesting. So please review the text of my Knesset statement, on the basis of which you could judge for yourself in a clear manner what my position is and that of France, and where there are differences of opinion and where there are points of agreement.

[Begin] With the permission of the president of the French Republic, I would like to add one more remark: I don't know if I have convinced the president, but I can assure you that I tried, I tried with all my heart.

[Question] Permit me to ask this question in Hebrew. Will France continue to give Iraq enriched uranium in such a high level that would make it possible for it to manufacture nuclear arms, or will it insist that it be supplied uranium at the caramel enrichment process level, for instance?

[Mitterrand] France will not supply any element that might bring about a nuclear war in any region whatsoever. The question directed at some is also directed at others, and without entering into a discussion over the technique involved in the caramel compared to other techniques, clearly any negotiations in this sphere -- not only with Iraq -- will aim at technical formulas that will allow us to promote the success of our industry without risking a nuclear war.

[Question] Mr President, this morning you said you regretted the Venice conference and the statements made there. Do you regret this to this very day and did you mention this to Chancellor Schmidt, your colleague, and to your other European counterparts, or was this only your own idea?

[Mitterrand] Sir, you certainly do not have to follow such deliberations, but if you had followed the deliberations of the Luxembourg meeting -- which was a European summit held a short while after I was elected president -- you would surely have noticed that at that time, along with Chancellor Schmidt and in his presence as well as with the other participants in the community of the Ten, I noted this. This means, I did not reject all the things said in the Venice conference, I only announced my feelings and I opposed some things. I regretted in Venice some facts which one can assume that, on the basis of information that should have been verified and that, for instance, attention should have been paid to the question of Afghanistan, too -- this too I regretted. I also regretted that the future of the Middle East, and particularly that the argument between Israel and the Palestinians was being carried out in a somewhat imperative languange, that is to say, it was not a comprehensive agreement. An agreement that is not comprehensive, but one that involves Israel and Egypt only, is not a good method. I have always maintained, ever since the Camp David accords -- although we recognize the limitations of those accords -- that it is better to march a few steps ahead in Paris or in parties of three, and advance toward peace in order to reach a partial agreement than not to do a thing. It seems to me that no comprehensive agreement can be reached the moment all are together with all the Arab countries, but also Israel and the PLO. [as heard] Thus it seems to me that it would be more realistic to act otherwise or at any rate, at least not to approve things as they were discussed. But, again, I could perhaps refer to the statements I made this morning. I did not criticize the Venice resolution on the need to find for the Palestinians a means to deliver them from the situation they are in.

[Question] Mr President, your very visit here constitutes a great change in France's policy. I would like to ask you what kind of cooperation you foresee following your visit here: In what spheres do you predict cooperation between France and Israel? Also, do you intend to invite the prime minister of Israel for a reciprocal visit to France?

[Mitterrand] It seems to me that the change has already found expression in my very presence. You may find this insufficient, but it is significant. I have not presumed apriori to solve in 2 days all the problems and to iron out all the differences in regard to the Middle East as far as France is concerned, nor did I presume -- and I repeat this again -- to solve myself things the five did not succeed in doing: the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Nations, the EEC, and the Arabs in Israel -- all of them failed to solve the problems.

I only noted, through my visit to Eretz Yisra'el, which followed some trips to Arab countries -- Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and other countries -- that the president of the French Republic does not discriminate. Israel is a respected state and must be taken into account. It exists. And even if I have some reservations in regard to its policy, this does not mean that such and such follows, and therefore I have explained, gentlemen, and there is no need to elaborate.

As for the visit of the prime minister of Israel to France, or that of the president of Israel -- this issue has not yet been discussed, and therefore I cannot address myself to it because the issue in question is a bilateral matter. Still, there is no difficulty and there is no need for diplomatic caution to say that as far as I am concerned there is no problem. As far as I am concerned, I will receive representatives of any country recognized by France, [and Israel is] one with which we have diplomatic relations, one whose past and present unite our nations, and this justifies such a trip.

From this it follows, let us say, that the question has not at all been raised, but it is only a question of the right opportunity, not of principle.

[Question] I would like to ask a question of both the prime minister and the president, with your permission, in Hebrew. Gentlemen, do you believe Israel and France can, or are likely to, cooperate in economic and political spheres in Africa?

[Mitterrand] You have really cornered me with this. What do you have in mind: Angola? Ethiopia? Nigeria? I do not know exactly in what countries, but France and Israel may have common interests in Africa.

Up to now, we have discussed relations between France and Israel, and this has rather heavily taken up our time and attention. But, off the cuff, I would say everything is possible, everything is open. The question was not discussed, so I can only tell you that cooperation between Israel and France in Africa does not appear at this moment to be a central problem between us. I do not know; I refuse nothing; I am prepared. It may be easier in Egypt than anywhere else, Mr Prime Minister -- is it not so?

[Begin] Well, I suppose -- with your permission, Mr President -- there is no sphere, no place where Israel and France could not cooperate. Even in Jerusalem we could cooperate, even in Paris, if I am invited there. [laughter]

[Question] My question in French is to President Mitterrand: Do you, Mr President, intend to play a more active role in regard to the situation in Lebanon? If so, in what direction?

[Mitterrand] We were never inactive -- neither my predecessor nor the governments that were in power for several years. Lebanon is dear to France; it is cherished in the hearts of Frenchmen. We want to contribute to the extent possible to anything that would serve the independence and integrity of that country.

You must understand however, that we cannot replace the legitimate government of that country. Therefore, this government -- with which we are maintaining good ties -- should express its opinion, whether it needs the services of France in a special way. Today, as you know, we are participating in the international force in southern Lebanon [UNIFIL]. We will continue to maintain ties with various figures in Lebanon, but we are careful not to take action except in accordance with the course chosen by the legitimate government.

[Question] Mr President of the French Republic: Are you satisfied with the state of cultural relations between Israel and France? Are you pleased with the teaching of French and the French culture in Israel? Will your visit mark a turning point in this regard? It seems to me that this might perhaps be required.

[Mitterrand] Some 70,000 Frenchmen are in Israel. French is a language which some 400,000 people in Israel know, and this of course is a proportion we would have been very happy to attain in other countries of the world as well. But if we look at the previous level attained in Israel, there is nevertheless a certain regression which our government should have taken action about in the best possible manner. Therefore, although I am not complaining, as this is not the result of ill-will on the part of Israel but the result of a series of situations that snowballed and there may also be some problems in regard to the teaching methods, the structure of our French presence. All these should be examined upon my return to my country, and I hope the teaching of this language will develop in Israel.

Culturally, it seems to me that in general there is room for satisfaction: there are exchanges, there are expressions [as heard], but the culture minister, who accompanies me in this visit, is the one who will reach the conclusions from the deliberations he will have held, and he will certainly know things, as he properly should.

[Question] Mr President, the Middle East conflict concerns not only the Israelis and the Palestinians, but also Israel and the Arab countries, with the exception of Egypt. There is a peace process that is being conducted in the Middle East according to the Camp David accords. How would you react to this process and how do you evaluate the negative attitude of the other Arab countries toward this process?

[Mitterrand] I have already said on which issues and under what circumstances I have adopted that initiative: the positive results of the establishment of peaceful ties between Israel and Egypt, which is not a mere pittance. The largest country in the Arab world, a direct neighbor of Israel geographically and historically, preferred peace over war, and this is progress which anyone could sense, and over which all should rejoice.

As for the solution of the Palestinian problem, the authorities in Israel -- the prime minister -- will say what they think about it. I have already expressed my views, namely that this step appears to me to be limited, that two countries that are as respected as are Egypt and Israel cannot sweep with them other countries into these negotiations -- this does not seem to me to be an element that could lead to a fundamental change of the resolutions that will be made, in terms of a real change in the Middle East. Still, it is known that the prime minister of Israel and his government have a position that differs from mine. I have said everything I had to say, this is where I will stop. I do not wish to speak for the parties in this part of the world, and as a Frenchman with a special responsibility in the United Nations, with traditional interests in the Middle East, I have my own view and I have expressed it. I also ask you, naturally, to understand my position.

[Question] I would like to ask both the prime minister and the president of France: Mr Prime Minister, you had the opportunity to explain Israel's views on the autonomy plan to the president of France. I was wondering first, Mr Prime Minister, whether you believe you helped persuade the president. And you, Mr President, were you persuaded? And what is your assessment of the proposals Israel has raised with respect to the autonomy?

[Begin] As you turned first to me, I will be the first to answer, with the president's permission. Yes, I brought up the problem of autonomy with the French president already yesterday in a private talk, which lasted about 90 minutes. I presented also to the president the French translation of the document that I had issued when the U.S. secretary of state was in Israel. I presented this document to him, and it is the same document I showed to General 'Ali, the Egyptian foreign minister. What we wrote in that document is the following: To try to achieve a breakthrough through negotiations on the autonomy matters while concentrating on the self-administration authority, as stipulated in the Camp David accords, because the Camp David accords say that when that administrative council, which will be elected democratically by the Arab inhabitants of Judaea, Samaria and Gaza, when things are done, then the interim period of 5 years will begin, after which Israel will also remove its military government. There will also be a withdrawal of the armed forces, and the forces that will remain will redeploy in security zones -- in other words, if we find a way, together with Egypt and the United States, who are partners to the negotiations, to establish and bring about the inauguration of that administrative council. If the Palestinian Arabs of Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district will for the first time in their history have elected representation, the military government will withdraw and then there will be 13 areas of day-to-day life which will be delegated fully, with no intervention by the Government of Israel in the autonomy institutions.

To provide a comparison, in Belgium there is autonomy for the Walloon population and the Flemish inhabitants, but the central Brussels government holds foreign, interior and other affairs in its own hands. Among other things, we give to the autonomy control over the fields of education, finance and justice. Not foreign affairs, because we do not intend to establish a Palestinian state, nor will we ever allow it because this will, of course, constitute a deadly danger to Israel. We must control security ourselves because if not, the organizations called in French OLP [PLO] will kill both Arabs and Jews, as they have been doing to this very day. Therefore, we suggested that all of us concentrate on the establishment of the administrative council and we hope that when the negotiations begin both with the United States and Egypt, we may still be able to obtain agreement [heskem] by 26 April. I fully agree, however, with Egyptian President Mr Mubarak when he declared that even if we do not reach an agreement by that date, we will still continue the negotiations until we reach an agreement. This is the state of affairs, and I found it my duty and necessity to explain to our dear friend, French President Francois Mitterrand, the question of autonomy and that of the administrative council, the democratic elections and the current stage of the negotiations.

[Mitterrand] The prime minister has even given me a document on this. He may have remained unconvinced that I was persuaded, and I will take with me the document -- which is quite voluminous -- and I will certainly read it, as I have already begun to do last night. In this context one could say that I do not have an opinion that would allow me to say that we have a solution at hand, but this we shall see in the future.

As for the prime minister's remarks, when he said that what the French call the OLP, is the PLO -- I of course, sensed in this comment a certain political and diplomatic nuance, and I would like to reassure him and tell him that what the French call the OLP is what the Americans call the PLO.

[Begin] Mr President, I don't object to the "O" of the "P"; I object to the "L."

[Question] This question, Mr President, is related to what you were asked earlier. I would like to ask whether you intend to invite Mr Yasir 'Arafat to Paris and if you really intent to extend such an invitation, what will it be like?

[Mitterrand] I have replied to this question at least 10 times, namely that if Mr 'Arafat wants to come to France, he can do so, just as other people from abroad can, for whom French soil is always open. We have never refused to permit them to come there.

If Mr 'Arafat wants to come and see me personally, I will reply that since France has no diplomatic relations with the PLO, and since it does not recognize the PLO as an organization that can express its opinion on behalf of all the Palestinians of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank -- it may be a representative, a combatant organization -- such a meeting is not under consideration.

[Question] In his speech this morning at the Knesset, the prime minister called on you to lead an initiative to organize an international charter involving the countries bordering on the Mediterranean for the prevention of war. Have you considered this suggestion? How do you react to it?

[Mitterrand] So far, the prime minister has given it more thought than I, because I only heard about this proposal a few hours ago and therefore had no time to think about it, but it is true that this suggestion has to do with the great events he had mentioned himself, like the Locarno pact, and therefore one should remember that that pact encountered a Nazi government in Germany. This is not to say that Locarno was founded on an error. The prime minister's desire thus stems from a grand historic idea, and it would be incautious of me to say that despite the dimensions of the question and the attendant difficulties involved in it, which are obvious, I would not like to refer to this wide scope of peace that will prevail in the Middle East. I will respond to it, however, after I have given the idea some thought and at the proper time. Yet I will again reply in the same manner that I did to the previous question on Mr 'Arafat's visit: I have already noticed something that should be recognized -- that France is taking into account the Palestinian reality as it sees it, the reality of those who express themselves in its name in the current struggle. But one should know what one wants.

Since we believe the decision of the Palestinians themselves is the one that should lead to our knowing who are the recognized and elected leaders of that population, we cannot at one and the same time talk about self-determination and decide for ourselves who will be the partner. Since we are realistic, we know what Mr 'Arafat represents -- and he has also, of course, met very many French personalities including government members, and I too am not promising anything. But to reply to your question, I do not think in the situation as it is today such a meeting could take place. We shall see, at a later stage -- and I hasten to add that the decision depends on him and on me, and I will not ask permission from anyone.

[Begin] Allow me to add just this, Mr President: You, my friend, ask too much of the president. Do you expect the president of the French Republic to make a decision on a suggestion just 6 hours after it was raised? At least give him 6 days to think about it. I believe it is a good idea and one that should be developed, but it is also necessary to carry out preparations. If the president takes the initiative, then he should approach such countries as Italy, Yugoslavia [words indistinct].

[Mitterrand interjects] Will you give me 6 weeks?

[Begin answers and continues his point] Yes. The countries of the Maghreb, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and also to Libya -- and then of course our countries: Egypt and Israel. It's a complicated matter, we have to work on it, and therefore, give the president some time to consider the subject and I, Mr President, will always be at your disposal.

[Question] I would like to ask one question and present it to both the president and the prime minister: Mr President, you have occasionally expressed your concern with the imbalance of power in Europe. Mr Prime Minister, you too have placed public opinion [passage indistinct due to break for 1700 Jerusalem Domestic newsreel]

[Live coverage resumes with question in progress] the relations between East and West Europe?

[Mitterrand] I cannot answer in a way that would presume to portray an analysis that follows a dialogue that never existed, but I will find no difficulty in explaining to you again what I think. Peace results from the balance of power between East and West. This balance was only rarely achieved, because the arms race has so far played the decisive factor. As for this side or the other, any discovery of new technology breeds more new technoloty, and so on and so forth, until the next esclation. The SS-20 is an answer to other systems and the Pershing-II in 1983 will provide an answer to the stationing of the SS-20 and therefore we must stop for a minute, hence, also the importance of the Geneva deliberations. I would like to remind all of the results, and you can certainly see that the situation is serious, but the main principle is a balance between the forces. I feel that in Europe -- and I have been saying this for some time now, and I said this to the National Assembly as well, even before last May, and I repeat this again and again -- in Europe there is an excessive concentration of arms, and a Soviet superiority of conventional arms, and the situation is unbearable for the West European countries. Thus it is necessary to negotiate, without giving way to pressures so that all the parties progress courageously and in earnest toward peace.

[Begin] We had three talks with the president -- one, which I have already mentioned -- yesterday and another two today. The specific problem you mentioned was not mentioned in the talks and therefore I can only speak on behalf of myself and express my views. All three democratic nations face a difficult problem that has not existed since the end of World War II: real extension of Soviet-Communist control. I can tell those present that in 7 and 1/2 years the Soviet Union took over -- directly or indirectly, by belligerent acts or by diverting attention -- seven countries, and this can continue on and on: Mozambique, Angola, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, South Yemen and others. This is a real danger.

As for Israel, Israel is of course an inseparable part of the free world and the Soviet Union is our neighbor. In Syria there are 6,000 military experts -- particularly army officers. In addition to the 4,000 tanks supplied to the Syrian Army, 2,000 Soviet tanks have been stationed not for the Syrians but for the Soviet Army. I am sorry, I have to correct myself -- 1,000 tanks. The 2,000 are positioned in Libya for the same purpose -- not for the Libyan Army but for the Soviet forces when the need arises.

As for the Middle East, there are also positions -- not of U.S. forces, but of Soviet forces, and I mentioned Libya because the Soviet Union is there with missiles, tanks and sophisticated plans. They are our neighbors along the sea, but this is also a unifying element, therefore we are also concerned about this growing strength.

Now I am getting to the main conclusion. I believe all free nations have a common interest in preventing further expansion by the Soviet Union, which is threatening the freedom and liberty of all free nations. This is an issue I raised during my meeting with U.S. President Reagan in September. He agreed with me. There was also the question of the European democracies. They have their own problems. They are tied in a pact with the United States. There is a dispute between the United States on the one hand and several European countries on the other hand, and this is only natural. Free nations always have differences of opinion, they do not hide them. They consider them until they either reach agreement, or they further work out the matters. However, the main issue, the danger that tyranny will take over country after country, is topical these days and must be on the agenda of all free nations.

[Mitterrand] I replied to this question [question apparently asked during the break in live coverage previously noted] only in regard to the European balance of power because I believed it could be limited to that issue, or that it would be too broad for us to discuss. The distinguished prime minister particularly noted Africa and the positions throughout the world. This issue will demand from him, and also from myself, many considerations which I will naturally not be able to address myself to.

Yet it is still necessary to distinguish between the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan and Poland and the influence obtained in the form of cooperation -- albeit sometimes forced -- in countries like Ethiopia, Libya or South Yemen, and to an even lesser degree in Angola. They are different.

Let me just add that the things I analyzed this morning at the Knesset -- when I said that every time there is a local dispute the two superpowers appear -- in regard to all the points I had mentioned, this can be discerned. Clearly, the West regards the United States differently, for after all NATO has no territory of its own. Obviously we ask the question, which is a serious one, regarding the Horn of Africa. Libya, Ethiopia, Yemen and three canals of the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, what is happening in Chad, in the conflict between Iraq and -- all these indicate all sorts of points on which positions have to be taken, and on this it would therefore be worthwhile to open one's eyes.

As for Angola, ask yourselves if in all of its invasions of Angola, South Africa is not actually causing the Cubans in those countries to remain there. The problem of Libya, Angola, South Africa -- all of them are interlinked and they attract the attention of the two superpowers, which ultimately accept the Cuban presence as well as the limited invasions of South Africa, thus creating a harmful situation in the world.

I say this because in France, too, there is a long tradition of activity in Africa -- and I will not elaborate on this here. It would take time, although it might be interesting. However, the prime minister of Israel, myself and the members of the press corps -- and you certainly -- will be interested in this, which is why I raised this, because in my opinion the balance of power occurs everywhere in the world and I expect the blocs to possibly disappear, but meanwhile, since this is called for, we must wish for ourselves that the bloc in which we count ourselves -- at least in the Atlantic sense -- will be able to at least, offset the other bloc. And I follow with great interest and attention everything that happens in Africa, and I say that France has all sorts of relations with that continent. It seems to me that only rarely were we in such a state of afairs where the relations between most of the African countries and us were so balanced, and I must add, also positive.

[Question] Mr President, may we hear your reaction to the official position of Mr Begin toward the Palestinian state. Secondly, how do you view Mr Begin's criticism of Claude Cheysson, your External Relations Minister?

[Mitterrand] I was aware of the opinions of Mr Begin, the prime minister of Israel, regarding the West Bank and the Gaza Strip even before I came here, and was not too surprised when I heard him expound on his thesis which he did brilliantly in the Knesset. Indeed, this time I was one of the direct listeners to his statements, and could see for myself -- better than when Mr Begin expressed his views some hundreds of kilometers away from Paris -- how ardent he was. So as far as judging and evaluating this -- I knew, and the prime minister confirmed things I had known -- this was so. You can see in this regard that there is a fundamental difference here, but this is part of a collection of political information [phrase as heard] that enabled us to proceed on many points. At any rate, it is clear and self-evident that this is in search for peace, nothing else.

But let us proceed to the second point: For 35 years, I was a member of the parliamentary body and I can say -- not because I am currently serving as the president -- that when someone from parliament does not want to state his opinion, he should be allowed not to do so. That is why I accepted a public argument. As for me, I never hesitated to state my position, which may not be liked by the prime minister of Israel. This is an open argument. The main thing was not to reach a dispute or an argument. We avoided this. The main thing was to formulate in the clearest fashion opinions on various issues, some of which interest you as far as Israel's and France's posiitons are concerned.

Since there was a public argument, since I spoke myself and was naturally careful when matters of courtesy were in question, I also thought about my duty in view of the fact that I am in a country that is hosting me.

Still I said what I wanted to. I did not try to please someone at the expense of my thoughts, and I hope this is how I too will be treated. This is the grandeur and inconvenience involved in a public argument. Had we limited relations to talks and exchanges of views through the silence of offices, then you would not have been able to present this question to me. But it is not simple in a democracy, on the international plane, and such discussions could be heard directly and rendered faithfully.

[Begin] I would like to add a comment; I did not criticize Mr Cheysson, I just quoted him. I repeated what he said. And, secondly, with regard to the Palestinian state, permit me to say what the problem is. It is our security problem, our life, our reality, our future, the country of our forefathers, the state of our children and our grandchildren. We are all free men. My colleagues and I will listen to any advice, to any leader, and we will discuss the problem freely, but in the end, I must warn everyone, in the end the decision is in our hands. It is not a problem for any other nation. That organization which I call -- either in English or in French and whose name certainly is not a liberation organization -- from whom do they want to liberate Palestine? From what do they want to liberate Palestine? [as heard]

I remember the day of liberation from British rule in Palestine. It is impossible to liberate the same country twice. It was already liberated in 1948, it was liberated when the last British soldier left the country. Terminology may be important, it is not decisive. They can call themselves this or that, that is not decisive. What is decisive is the aspiration to destroy our country, our people, and they write that in their charter. There are those who tell us: Do not pay attention to what is written. I remember that advice in the 1930's when I was a young man, hardly an adult yet and that advice was then given to us in connection with a book called "Mein Kampf." They said it was local propaganda and many people really did not pay attention and the result is known. And thus whenever an enemy of the Jewish people tells us that he wants to destroy us we take this seriously.

We must believe that he really does want to destroy us, and only then will we be able to do whatever is humanly possible to make it impossible for him to fulfill his murderous plot and this is the only way to guarantee our future and the future of our children. You must pay attention to the fact that there is a book, there is a clear document in which it is written that the State of Israel should be wiped off the face of the earth. Neither more nor less -- a document in which it is said that the citizens of this country will be able, if they are Jews, to remain only if they were born in the country before -- I am quoting -- the beginning of the Zionist invasion, that is, the Balfour Declaration, 1917. If this were the case, my grandchildren would have to leave the country. Certainly my children, and I myself, certainly. I have only lived here for 40 years, I have only just come from abroad. All of us came or were born after that date, what is called the beginning of the Zionist invasion, 2 November 1917. Now, according to that charter, we should take our belongings and move on.

This is our country, this is our land, our civilization was born here. Here we built our state thousands of years ago. Here we built the temple and from here came the words of the prophets about everlasting peace, here our kings, since David, King David, ruled here. This is the land we dreamed of. I still remember that we, in our old homes, which no longer exist -- there is no father, no mother, no brother, no small nephews, only a sister and I remained alive -- but in that little home, that poor home, but beloved, we used to say: We will return to Eretz Yisra'el. My father and his children never said: We will go to Eretz Yisra'el; we will travel to Eretz Yisra'el. We always used to say, we will return, we will return. That is Zionism. The land lives in our hearts. Even when we were there in the Diaspora, nobody stopped us from claiming that eternal right that the Jewish people have to this country. There are no invaders. There are no conquerers. We live here by right, forever, and if enemies try to declare and say that the State of Israel must be wiped off the map, that it must no longer exist, then we say: You will never achieve this end of yours. We want peace with all our neighbors, we want to live with the Arabs in Eretz Yisra'el in equal rights, in human dignity, in social justice, in economic progress and now we suggested to them autonomy, full autonomy, the most far-reaching autonomy that has ever existed on the face of the earth in these days -- more than [word indistinct], more than in Belgium, that you mentioned.

More than all other places put together. And no war. No bloodshed. It is possible to live together. It has been proved. And Israel -- I ask you to take note and tell all those people -- that the PlO, OLP, PLO, that they will never achieve their plot and Israel will exist forever. Today I am the prime minister. Tomorrow I will be an ordinary citizen. There will be another prime minister, but this will always continue and Israel will continue from generation to generation. Thank you for your attention.

[Mitterrand] I would still like to reply to Mr (Valette), because if we are speaking about a dispute, then we are moving from a dispute to matters of content, things the prime minister said and which pertain to matters of content. After all, I agree with them. It is not a question of whether France would accept Israel being wiped from the face of the earth. As for the question asked at the beginning, I will tell (Valette) that in any case, Cheysson did not go to Abu Dhabi and Iraq without my knowledge and without my agreement. It was as president and head of the government of the Republic of France that the external relations minister was instructed to go and to report to me of his mission. And this was done.

MITTERRAND STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF VISIT

TA042228 Jerusalem Domestic Television Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Report by political correspondent Elimelekh Ram]

[Excerpt] Political observers have pointed to the fact that at the end of President Mitterrand's visit no joint communique was issued. There is no procedure that makes it incumbent to hold a joint news conference or the issuing of a joint communique after such a meeting, the prime minister's adviser on communications affairs, Uri Porat, said this evening. This time, he said, it was decided to hold a news conference and refrain from issuing a communique. So much for the prime minister's adviser on communications affairs.

Jerusalem sources believe that differences on basic issues in the political sphere have at this stage prevented the issuing of such a communique. Political circles pointed to the fact that after President Mitterrand's visit to Saudi Arabia a joint communique was also not issued. These circles also say that now France understands our positions better and we understand theirs better. These circles regard the very fact of the visit having been held as a genuine achievement. According to them, it presages a new era in the relations between Israel and France.

What are the real achievements of the visit? From now on, so it is hoped, there will be a friendly dialogue with France. There will be real progress in bilateral issues, in the fields of economy, technology, research and culture. In the future, agreements will be planned on the issues of security procurement. France will help Israel in the war against the Arab boycott. It will be attentive to Israeli interests in the EEC. There will be French aid to Israel in its fight against Arab initiatives against it in Europe and in the international arena.

In an informal talk, President Mitterrand conducted this evening after the news conference with scores of correspondents who surrounded him, the French president repeated his emphasis that despite the differences of opinion with the Government of Israel, as far as he was concerned, the main point was the very fact of the visit and the thaw in relations that were frozen for the last 15 years.

The visiting president revealed to those listening to him that he has been invited on a state visit to Jordan. He has accepted the invitation and he intends to visit there in the near future.

MITTERRAND OUTLINES MIDEAST POLICY TO ALIGNMENT

TA050609 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0505 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Last night, Francois Mitterrand repeated that France cannot ignore the Palestinian problem.

It is inconceivable that 1 million people should live under foreign rule. They need a country. He said this at a meeting with Alignment representatives which our correspondent Arye Golan also attended.

[Begin recording] [Golan] In the evening, in a pleasant atmosphere, the French president and members of his political party conferred with the members of its sister party in Israel. Israeli and French flags along with the red banner were placed at the side of the table. Despite the differences, MK Yitzhaq Rabin told the guest, we must cooperate even if we do not agree on everything.

[Rabin] We are entering a period in which there will not be the stable, although narrow, basis for cooperation between our countries like the cooperation beginning in the 1950's up to the 6-day war. The international and Middle East reality has changed. I would like to express the hope that we will still be able to continue to develop the ties not only between the parties but also between the nations and countries, even when there are differences of opinion on the Palestinian issue. I would also like to hope that the manifestation of this will first and foremost be in that France under your leadership will not lend a hand to a European initiative founded in resolutions in the style of the Venice resolutions.

[Golan] By virtue of the post I am holding, Francois Mitterrand told his fellow members of the Socialist International with a smile, I am prevented from interfering in the internal politics in Israel, but I am nevertheless at liberty to express in public my feelings of friendship toward you. I have listened to you, Yitzhaq Rabin, Mitterrand said, and I can sum up France's Middle East policy in three principles: It will never lend its hand to an action that might destroy Israel; we will make sure Israel continues to exist forever; peace is important for Israel and its development.

At this point the French president emphasized that France cannot ignore the Palestinian problem. It is unthinkable that 1 million men and women should live under foreign rule. This problem must be solved, whether you like it or not. They need a country, an identity.

As to where this will lead, the guest from Paris added, this will be decided by the Palestinians and also by yourselves because you live in the area, you are being threatened, and you must receive binding commitments on your right to live here. After about an hour the meeting ended, but not before Labor Party Chairman Shim'on Peres presented the visiting president an album translated into French on Jewish art. [end recording]

CHEYSSON SAYS 'NO DIFFERENCES' WITH BEGIN

TA050138 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1000 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] The French external relations minister says there are no differences of opinion or misunderstandings between himself and the prime minister. Mr Begin's comments about him were made because this is part of his nature. Minister Cheysson was speaking at the close of a meeting with Mr Begin at his residence in Jerusalem. He told our correspondent Freddy Eytan that the conversation was held in a very friendly and warm atmosphere and that Mr Begin was as energetic as ever.

FRANCE PLEASED WITH RESULTS OF MITTERRAND VISIT

TA051122 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] French Minister of External Relations Claude Cheysson has said that the French are very pleased with the result of President Mitterrand's visit and that the visit had actually achieved what the French Government had wanted. The French delegation received clear explanations and gestures of friendship. Cheysson added that Foreign Minister Shamir's visit to Paris, which will apparently take place within 2 months, will be the first in a series of high-level consultations between the two countries.

FRANCE'S CHEYSSON MEETS WITH W. BANK MAYORS

TA041650 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 1510 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] French External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson is now meeting with the Arab mayors from Judaea, Samaria and the Gaza district. Prime Minister Mehahem Begin instructed the commander of the Central Command and the coordinator of activities in the territories to permit Nabulus Mayor Bassam Ash-Sahk'ah to leave his town in order to take part in the talk with Cheysson. Our correspondent 'Arad Nir reports on the talk being held in the French Consulate building in west Jerusalem.

[Nir] Well, right now French External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson is meeting with Nabulus Mayor Bassam Ash-Shak'ah, with Ramallah Mayor Karim Khalaf, with Bethlehem Mayor Ilyas Frayj and with Gaza Mayor Rashad Ash-Shawwa. Almost up to the last minute it was not clear if Nabulus Mayor Bassam Ash-Shak'ah would be able to come to this meeting because an order restricting his movements by the military government is in effect against him, an order banning him from leaving his town's jurisdiction. This morning we learned from security sources that Prime Minister Menahem Begin personally instructed the commander of the Central Command, Uri Or, and the coordinator of activities in the territories, Rehavya Vardi, to permit Ash-Shak'ah to come to the meeting in Jerusalem. It has been learned that at the meeting the mayors will raise their opposition to autonomy and they will stress their solidarity with the PLO as the representative of Palestine. It also appears that they will also indicate to Minister Claude Cheysson difficulties they are having with Israeli rule. It should be noted that the mayors refused to meet with President Mitterrand because, according to them, that right is reserved only for 'Arafat. Some people see in this a sort of hint to the president of France to invite 'Arafat for an official visit to his country.

Details of Meeting

TA042029 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1728 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] While the president of France was receiving an honorary doctorate from Hebrew University, his external relations minister, Claude Cheysson, was meeting with four mayors from the territories. The meeting was attended by Bassam Ash-Shak'ah, Karim Khalaf, Ilyas Frayj and Rashad Ash-Shawwa and they outlined the situation of the Palestinians to the French minister. Here is a report by our correspondent in Judaea and Samaria, Arye Gus:

[Gus] The invitation of the four mayors to a meeting with French External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson represents no small achievement and the French, and particularly the French consul, invested much work in it. To date no personalities from the territories have met in this way with an official guest of the State of Israel. The composition of the participants in the meeting was well balanced and included the supporters of the extremist camp in the PLO, Karim Kahaf and Bassam Ash-Hak'ah, and supporters of Fatah, Ilyas Frayj and Gaza Mayor Rashad Ash-Shawwa. The participants discussed matters involving the Palestinians with the French minister, of course, and they submitted a memo to him including a survey of the Palestinian question. More than that, said the mayor of Gaza, Rashad Ash-Shawwa, we decided not to report.

[Begin Ash-Shawwa recording -- in English] We submitted a memorandum that dealt with the whole Palestine problem and we have agreed that we are not going to give any other statement. [end recording]

[Gus] Not all the mayors were satisfied with the meeting and its contents, but nevertheless all the mayors from the territories finally signed the document submitted to Cheysson. Here are some sections from it: The mayors demand of France that it not work within the framework of the Camp David agreements. French participation in the MFO is a slap in the face of the Palestinians.

They hope for aid from France and demand that it act to stop Israel's actions in the territories, such as expropriation of land, taking over control of sources of energy and water and so on.

The PLO is the sole representative of the Palestinian people, the mayors emphasized, and we are fighting to preserve our rights in all the ways at our disposal, against Israel which is trying to erase our entity. And, also in the document which is termed the black book, there is a survey of Zionism and its actions in the territories. Nabulus Mayor Bassam Ash-Shak'ah bitterly condemned the Civilian Administration and called it worse than the Military Government. Bethlehem Mayor Ilyas Frayj asked Cheysson to work for the return of the mayors of Hebron and Halhul and Cheysson reported that President Mitterrand had already raised that issue at his meetings with Prime Minister Menahem Begin.

APPEAL TO MITTERRAND MADE ON EXPELLED MAYORS

TA042024 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Attorney Felicia Langer this evening sent a message to French President Mitterrand asking him to help get the two mayors expelled from the Hebron Hills back. They are Fahd Al-Qawasimi and Muhammad Milhim. She cites human rights as her reason for requesting this. Our correspondent Pinhas 'Inbari reports that earlier the issue was raised by West Bank mayors during their conversation with Claude Cheysson, but the French external relations minister did not give any clear-cut answer on this.

DETAINED GOLAN DRUZE APPEAL TO FRENCH PRESIDENT

TA041245 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] The Six Golan Druze notables who are in administrative detention asked the French president this morning to protest to Israel about the extension of Israeli law to the Golan. They also asked him to protest, what they call suppression of the civilian population and the imposition of a siege on it, due to its desire to safeguard its national identity.

On the Golan Heights, moderate Druze are receiving favorable treatment from Israeli authorities. Our correspondent Yo'el Dar reports that telephones in the houses of Druze loyal to Israel have been reconnected to the national telephone grid, shepherds from moderate clans are entitled to tend their herds on state land or in areas close to the border, and moderate laborers receive transit permits to leave Golan villages for work in Israel or to visit relatives. A reliable source told our correspondent that Israeli loyalists will get everything they are due and perhaps even more than that, whereas the others and, particularly the extremists, will have to make do with less.

BEGIN NOT TO ATTEND MITTERRAND FAREWELL

TA051217 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1200 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] This afternoon the French president met with French citizens in Israel, including immigrants from France holding dual citizenship and members of the French Embassy staff. He asked them to continue to maintain ties with France. He then departed for lunch with the French ambassador to Israel. In an hour he is to leave for Ben-Gurion Airport, from where he will fly back to Paris. Preparations for the farewell ceremony for President Mitterrand have been completed at Ben-Gurion Airport. Prime Minister Menahem Begin will not come to the airport, and he will be represented by Simha Ehrlich.

BEGIN SUFFERING FROM 'ACCUMULATED FATIGUE'

TA042306 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2300 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin is now sleeping in a room in the King David Hotel. His physician, Professor Gottesman, is watching over him. The prime minister's office has announced that because of the packed events of the last few days Mr Begin is suffering from accumulated fatigue. His personal physician has ordered him to rest. Our correspondent Avraham Ben-Melekh comments that the prime minister felt ill during the dinner given by President Mitterrand at the King David Hotel. The visiting president this evening wished good health to the prime minister. He said that he understood that the prime minister was very tired. He himself was also tired. There are various reasons for fatigue, he added, with a smile.

Undergoing Tests

TA050539 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0528 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Prime Minister Mehahem Begin woke up an hour ago. He is in his room at the King David Hotel. This is reported by our correspondent Avraham Ben-Melekh. The director general of the prime minister's office, Matityahu Shmuelevitz, has reported that the prime minister is feeling well and is currently undergoing tests by his physicians. When the examination ends, a statement will be issued on the prime minister's health.

To Resume Regular Schedule

TA050714 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0700 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin will observe the regular schedule today, despite the fatigue he was struck with last night, which forced him to spend the night at the King David Hotel, where the state dinner for President Mitterrand was held. He will return home soon, and will then receive French External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson there. Cheysson will meet his counterpart, Yitzhaq Shamir, before that. President Mitterrand has meanwhile left by helicopter from Jerusalem to visit 'Akko and Kibbutz Lohame Hageta'ot. Then he will attend a reception on behalf of the French Embassy in Tel Aviv. He will leave the country in the early afternoon hours.

HADDAD THREATENS FORCE AGAINST STRONGER UNIFIL

TA050803 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0505 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Maj Sa'd Haddad has announced he would not allow UNIFIL to deploy their reinforcement units along the eastern front between the Beaufort Castle and Marj 'Uyun. He emphasized that he will have to use force to do this. According to Haddad, the terrorists have recently been fortifying their positions in southern Lebanon, and so additional UNIFIL forces, he says, will lead to the immediate resumption of hostilities by the terrorists, who will feel secure, hiding behind the apron of the UN soldiers. Here is a report by our correspondent, Hayim Hecht:

[Begin recording] [Hecht] On the eastern front of southern Lebanon, between Marj 'Uyun and the Beaufort Castle, there are no UNIFIL outposts or positions at present. Haddad calls that area the gate, from which we will invade the terrorists' territory, and they are well aware of this, he added. Let them fire one shell, and we will immediately be in there.

[Haddad -- in English] That's right, 100 percent because now the PLO if they are stopping from shelling, [it is] because they are afraid from the reaction of us, or Israel, and they are afraid that there will be movement -- not only exchange of shelling.

[Hecht translates the above into Hebrew and continues] Stationing UNIFIL positions between us and them will give them a feeling of security and the villagers in southern Lebanon and the Galilee pandhandle residents will sustain volleys of Kayusha rockets and shells.

[Haddad -- in English] If they will not let us the choice and they will come by force, so that's the only option that they will leave for us. We are going to defend it because this is our life. We are going to defend it because this is our life. We are not going to give our lives for the beautifil eyes of any UN soldiers.

[Hecht translates the above into Hebrew and continues] Haddad believes fighting will resume in the sector in days. He emphasizes that the terrorists are constantly fortifying their positions, getting more arms and working on improving their posts.

[Haddad -- in English] Every day they are working in fortification and we even see them blowing up the rocks to make fortifications day and night, also, they are working there, very hard and very quickly.

[Hecht translates the above into Hebrew and continues] Haddad says it is hardly likely that they take much trouble for nothing. [end recording]

IDF EVACUATES 22 FAMILIES FROM TALME YOSEF

TA041342 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] The evacuation of 22 families opposing the withdrawal is at this hour being concluded in Moshav Talme Yosef. Our correspondent Moti 'Eden reports that the settlers and their personal belongings will be delivered to a military base near Beersheba, from whence the settlers will go wherever they want to. The evacuation of the families proceeded calmly. Our correspondent remarks that the settlers did not receive assistance from their colleagues, members of the Movement to Stop the Sinai Withdrawal. Last night, a few more dozen of youngsters arrived in Yamit, who joined the withdrawal opponents who are on the location.

Settlers Return

TA050815 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0800 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] IDF soldiers are now evacuating settlers who had penetrated Talme Yosef once again during the night. This morning, the commander of the Southern Command issued a decree to Moshav residents, saying that anyone who is not a resident of the place must leave. During the night, the IDF evacuated a few dozen withdrawal opponents. Our correspondent, Shalom Oren, reports that the chairman of the district settlers' committee, Yitzhaq Regev, has said he would ask the prime minister to take action and see that the compensation agreement signed with the Knesset Finance Committee is implemented. He said the settlers of the old moshavim are not digging in and they are not planning any violent actions, they will just wait for Mr Begin's ruling.

FURTHER EVACUATIONS IN YAMIT DISTRICT REPORTED

TA041544 Jerusalem Domestic Servicein Hebrew 1500 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] IDF forces are now evacuating members of the Stop the Sinai Withdrawal Movement from another two settlements in the Yamit District: Ma'oz Hayam and Nir Avraham. Our military correspondent Shmu'el Tal reports that the people are being evacuated willingly. There are 3 families in Ma'oz Hayam and 12 families in Nir Avraham.

ALGERIA

CULTURAL AGREEMENT WITH PLO SIGNED 4 MAR

LD042206 Algiers Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] At noon today at the Algerian Foreign Ministry, an Algerian-Palestinian cultural agreement was signed which aims to consolidate relations between the Algerian and Palestinian revolutions, particularly in culture, science and technology.

The agreement was signed on the Algerian side by member of the Political Bureau and Foreign Minister Mohamed Benyahia, who was accompanied by his most senior aides, and on the Palestinian side by member of the PLO Executive Committee and chief of its Political Department, Faruq Qaddumi, who was accompanied by members of his delegation.

The agreement, which was concluded following talks between the Palestinian delegation and some Cabinet ministers, provides for enhanced exchanges between the two sides in education and scientific research. In this respect, the two sides stressed the great importance they attach to the exchange of textbooks and information about the histories of both countries and peoples within the framework of scholastic programs.

The agreement provides for the holding of joint conferences and the exchange of technical, athletic and youth visits, which in turn will enhance further fraternal ties between the Algerian and Palestinian peoples. The agreement also refers to the conditions of Palestinian teachers working in Algeria and matters concerning their terms of employment and salaries within the framework of improving bilateral cooperation in education and scientific research.

FLN SIGNS ACCORD WITH LEBANESE AMAL MOVEMENT

LD042148 Algiers Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] The FLN and the Lebanese Amal movement signed a cooperation agreement this morning at the headquarters of the FLN.

The agreement was signed by Sulayman 'Uthman, member of the FLN Central Committee and head of the party's Foreign Relations Department, and members of the Amal movement delegation. Following the signing, 'Uthman expressed his hope that talks between the two sides will continue with a view to bolstering relations and exchanges of information between the two parties. The head of the Lebanese delegation said Algeria has fought and continues to fight against illiteracy, imperialism, Zionism and colonialism. He said it has helped and continues to help the liberation movements fighting against the enemies of peace and justice. We gain confidence, he said, when we recall Algeria's triumph over imperialism.

LIBYA

AL-QADHDHAFI ADDRESSES PEOPLE'S CONGRESS 3 MAR

LD031330 Tripoli Domestic Service in Arabic 1034 GMT 3 Mar 82

[Speech by Col Mu'ammar Al-Qadhdhafi to emergency session of the General People's Congress at the ideological orientation center in Tripoli -- live]

[Excerpts] Proceeding from the (?principle) that revolutionary force is the building of the popular will until it reaches a level that will enable it to exercise authority without the need for inciters, I have come here to explain some points I raised yesterday and another regarding the people's committees.

Due to its excess oil production and its policy, which is under U.S. influence, Saudi Arabia constitutes a real danger to the economy of the Libyan people, the Algerian people, the Arab people in the Gulf and also Nigeria and a number of oil exporting countries which rely only on oil. Yesterday, I was speaking in a square filled with a million people; there was no calm and one could not dot the I's or cross the T's. But today we are in a hall and are able to speak calmly about the issue. The oil file was supposed to be clear before the people's congresses.

What is happening is that the oil market has been flooded. There is a glut. Oil tankers are loaded with oil but no one wants to buy. This is due to the increase in Saudi oil production which has reached 8.5 million barrels a day.

Saudi Arabia is selling its oil cheaply, not at the posted price. Saudi Arabia is lying. Saudi oil is owned by princes, 5,000 of them, each owning an oil well, a share in the oil. Each of them wants to invest in companies, hotels, places of entertainment, palaces, drinking places, private planes and private businesses. Each of the Saudi princes spends what an entire people could spend. Saudi oil, therefore, is owned by princes. How is it possible to control 5,000 princes through OPEC? How can they maintain prices; they look after their private interests not state interests. In Libya, the state, the people, own the oil. The Libyan state owns the oil, while in Saudi Arabia oil is the property of individuals, of the princes. Saudi Arabia, on U.S. order, produces so much oil. Every now and then an oil well dries up. This being the case, Saudi Arabia will become bankrupt and its oil exhausted in the near future. The United States is taking Saudi oil and storing it. The princes are selling oil and receiving the money to put it in banks. [words indistinct]. Every now and then an oil well dries up in Saudi Arabia. The Americans lie to the Saudis and say to them: You have a vast reserve of oil which will last for years. And when an oil well dries up, the Americans say it has dried up [words indistinct]. Oil will be exhausted in a short time.

We, on the other hand, have our oil in our land and it will last for years. This is important. If one has money or any other material which people do not want to buy at the moment, one is not regarded as poor. You have gold and no one wants to buy it, but you are not poor. There will come a time when this gold is wanted. But for one to (?oversell oil and gas), this is the road to becoming poor. One can decide not to export oil or to reduce exports to the minimum so that this oil will last scores of years and will not be exhausted quickly [words indistinct].

It is true that the Libyan oil is in the ground. You should not regard Libya as a poor country at all; it is rich with oil and gas and there is wealth beneath our feet; we have not squandered it like they do in Saudi Arabia. But now, as a result of the surplus of Saudi oil, we cannot sell the quantity which we decided to sell because those who would buy from us will say that they are buying from Saudi Arabia. This is the policy of Saudi Arabia. Those people whom I condemned yesterday were condemned because we are fed up with them. There is no friendly and fraternal method that we have not tried. We have met with and told them: Brothers, this is a serious matter; you should not produce 8.5 million barrels a day. You are harming the peoples of Kuwait, Libya, the Gulf, Algeria, Nigeria and others; you are inflicting real harm on them. In Kuwait the amir is shouting and saying that Saudi Arabia is killing me. He says: Saudi Arabia wants me to submit. The people are not buying my oil but are buying the cheap oil from Saudi Arabia which has glutted the market with oil in order to make us submit. The Gulf people feel that Saudi Arabia has replaced them in the oil market so that they will submit. In this manner, Saudi Arabia gathered them together and established the Gulf Cooperation Council and a security pact. What is the meaning of a security pact? It means that Saudi Arabia has become dominant over Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait and the UAE.

Saudi Arabia is expanding so as to dominate the whole of the peninsula. It is now trying to dominate North Yemen in the hope of threatening and even occupying South Yemen. The so-called Arabian Peninsula will become the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It wants to make them submit. It is acting on orders from the United States [words indistinct]. They want us to submit to Saudi Arabia. The Saudis are selling their oil in all markets to all Libya's customers so that Libya will not be able to sell its oil. [sentence indistinct] This is so that the Libyans will not be able to sell their oil and therefore they will become short of money and will start to shout and put an end to the revolution and to the jamahiri regime; then the Libyans will join the caravan and submit to the United States and to Saudi Arabia and will become one of the dependent countries. This is what the U.S. plan is all about. There is a challenge to us -- a challenge to which our dignity, our revolution, our sovereignty and all our values are linked to our stomachs and not to any other values. With or without oil, we are against the United States, against reaction and for Arab unity and Palestine. We constantly are challenged to abandon our principles in return for favors from them or because of (?threats). We adhere to our principles and we do not care about oil or anything else.

I asked Saudi Arabia for a meeting of the OPEC council. Kuwait agreed, Algeria agreed and the Emirates agreed. But they said no. They said it was not the right time. Why not the right time? Perhaps not until Libya submits and all the Arab states become subservient to Saudi Arabia. They said this problem can wait. We said we should meet at summit level because the situation is grave. They said no, there is no need for (?anxiety). We said reduce your oil. They did not reduce it. They were lying. They said they had reduced it but it turned out that they did not reduce production. Why are they selling at a low price, for example, and then they say that we are selling at the price agreed by OPEC? They are liars and have no scruples. They have no ethics at all.

King Khalid is not included among these; he is not one of them. As for reaction, I have decided to sever relations with it; I personally did it so as to be on the side of the revolutionary forces [words indistinct]. King Khalid is a good and pious man. He knows nothing about the falsehoods of Fahd and Sultan. These abuses are not directed against him. He loves Muslims and so forth. But he is a figurehead, only a figurehead. Thus King Khalid is excepted from all this abuse which is directed only against the others. There will be no meeting between me and these persons until Saudi Arabia is liberated and there is a revolution [words indistinct]. Saudi Arabia must be liberated because it is under the U.S. and Zionist flags and U.S. and Jewish planes fly over it. It is under the control of the Jews and Christians. U.S. planes fly daily over Saudi Arabia. U.S. planes even fly over Mecca. The skies of Mecca and Madinah are soiled. Had there been a true Islamic movement, it would have liberated it before any other place. The liberation of Saudi Arabia presently is more important than the performance of the pilgrimage.

I abuse them now because I have come to sever all relations with them. [Words indistinct] no fraternal means that we used have succeeded. We sent them letters, mediators and [words indistinct]. The right thing is instigation for revolution to liberate the Arab oil from the grip of reaction and from the grip of the United States.

With its oil and [words indistinct] Saudi Arabia has become a bigger threat to the Arabs than Israel and the United States. The Saudis have become so stubborn that they don't bother to listen to anyone. They depend on the United States for protection. But they are fools. The United States could not protect the shah of Iran, Haile Selassie, Idriss as-Sanusi, Lon Nol, Kao Ky. All of them were under U.S. influence. But they have fallen. As-Sadat also has fallen though he wept for them. The United States cannot protect one single agent. Thank God, its agents are falling like autumn leaves. Only the revolutionary forces can last and triumph. But the reactionaries are falling one after another.

The United States has linked its destiny to that of reaction so the U.S. destiny also is doomed. One day it will be contained within its own borders. All peoples are now against the United States and are tired of it.

What is most important now is that the quantity of oil now being sold is small, less than the scheduled quantity. During your meetings within the basic people's conferences, you had a file before you outlining the quantities of oil being sold. The file contained the entire oil problem. There are daily developments. Saudi Arabia today adds 1 million barrels. Tomorrow, the situation will change. Today, for instance, a country is losing the value of its oil. Tomorrow, the situation will change. Every 24 hours there is a change in the oil market. The situation will not remain so, if there is a need for oil and if there is a need to resume oil exports in vast quantities. We believe this is an attempt by the United States to subjugate the peoples, to [words indistinct] the Palestinian cause as its target, and also to deprive Libya of the arms and money with which it feeds the Palestinian revolution. The Americans have severed relations with us for no (?reasonable cause known to us). We did not show enmity toward the United States. We want the United States, Russia and all the other great powers to be the same. As far as we are concerned, we want to have equal and neutral relations with each of them. But the United States is biased toward Israel with all its might; it is hostile to the Arabs. Not only hostile, it shows disregard to the Arabs [words indistinct]. The Soviet Union does not, at least, sell arms to Israel but it sells arms to the Arabs. All the socialist countries including the USSR have severed political relations with Israel since 1967, with the exception of Romania when Arab countries, such as Egypt, Somalia, Sudan and Oman, recognize the Zionist enemy since 1967. But now Egypt, Sudan and the United States are bringing pressure to bear on the African states to compel them to resume relations with the Israelis. They tell them: There is an Arab state which has recognized Israel so why do you Africans not do so? Is that right? Is what I am saying right? I am saying this and the Africans are sitting here listening to me. This Arab state recognized Israel. How can we boycott Israel while the Arabs recognize it? This is the dilemma in which they place us. They have demolished the policy laid down against the enemy in Africa.

We would have liked to keep our relations with the United States normal. Even after the revolution, we concluded a deal to purchase fighter and transport aircraft and trucks. We concluded deals concerning military and civilian transport aircraft. The United States canceled them all. First, it canceled the fighter aircraft deal and said there is revolution in Libya and similar trends. No fighter aircraft [words indistinct]. The relations continued between us -- trade and civilian relations. Then the United States issued a decision banning the export of the C-130 military transport aircraft. We told it that we would use them for civilian transportation, would modify them so that they would be suitable for civilian transportation only. But it refused. Libya should not be given aircraft [words indistinct]. We kept quiet and made no trouble. Then there was a deal concerning civilian aircraft -- the jumbos -- for the transportation of passengers. It killed it.

It banned the sale of jumbo aircraft to Libya. It issued an embargo banning the sale of drilling and other oil equipment, electronic equipment, [words indistinct] equipment to Libya. The sale of all electronic equipment to Libya is banned. The purchasing of oil from Libya also is banned. It ordered American companies to withdraw from Libya. During all that period, there were meetings between us and America -- delegations and mediation. Indeed, we were not intentionally hostile but our stand is firm; we have principles and our directions are clear. The principles are not open for discussion. Other matters [words indistinct] our policy.

Neither of us can change the policy of the other; we are unable to change the policy of the United States and make it befriend the Arabs because America is the staunchest enemy of the Arabs, of Islam and the east, and if it has relations with any Arab state, it is because the Arab state is an agent and because U.S. interests predominate over those of the people of this Arab state. It if has relation [word indistinct] an Islamic country or a state in the east it is because America has an interest and the other state has no interest. It is possible that a ruler has an interest [words indistinct] to protect him from the revolution, but no ruler who ever allied himself with America has obtained protection from the latter against revolution. The ones who win are the masses. This is a hostile, crusader attitude. Indeed, America continues to pursue Christian crusades.

If the U.S. 6th Fleet heads in the direction of the Gulf of Sidra, it is a 20th century crusade-like campaign. It is no different from the campaigns of [words indistinct] or that of Charles V which were directed against Jerusalem, Egypt, Tunisia, and Algeria. The crusade-like campaign is continuing. The U.S. 6th Fleet or the (?10th) Fleet harbor anger against Islam and against the Arabs as there is uprising, revolution and freedom which must be destroyed so that these peoples remain exhausted and divided, thus allowing the United States and its allies to plunder their resources.

Libya used to be under U.S. domination and used to open its territory for U.S. bases; its oil used to be taken by the United States and [words indistinct] but who benefitted? The United States. When the Libyan people took charge of their own affairs, the United States turned into an enemy of Libya. If there is friendship between the United States and an Arab country, it means this is to the advantage of the United States and the disadvantage of the Arab state. The ruler of this state might benefit temporarily but he will fall and the United States will not be able to prolong his life at all. The United States failed to prolong the life of As-Sadat, Haile Selassie or the shah of Iran.

Many states mediated between us and the United States. Saudi Arabia did so. When King Khalid came here, he said we would resolve the problems. We said all right; we have no desire to be hostile to the United States; the United States cannot change our stance nor can we change its. We still say that Palestine is Arab and will prepare for its liberation; this is settled. Any one [words indistinct]. We do not want the conferences which compromise our rights. The existence in our midst of a foreign state hostile to the Arabs is but a poisonous dagger in the body of the Arabs -- we must remove this dagger to preserve our existence. The presence of the Israeli entity in the midst of the Arab homeland is a danger to [words indistinct] the Arab homeland.

There is no solution other than purging the Arab homeland of the intruding forces. Our stand is clear. We are revolutionaries building popular authority, building socialism. We choose our own allies and friends. These are our principles and the United States cannot change them and it knows it. U.S. policy is hostile to us. (?Why must we be afraid). The United States is an avowed enemy of the Arab nation and Islam and a true ally of the Israelies. [passage indistinct] Saudi Arabia is allied to the United States which, in fact, is the same as an alliance with Israel. We have two papers. One is signed by the United States and Saudi Arabia and the other is signed by the United States and Israel. What does it mean? In effect, it means the signature of Saudi Arabia, Israel and the United States on one agreement. One cannot hide the sun. [words indistinct] They have done their utmost to stop us from selling our oil. What else can they do to us? We fear neither the United States nor Saudi Arabia nor Arab reaction, as we know they are doomed. They used to say don't antagonize As-Sadat [words indistinct]. Where is As-Sadat now? We tried every mediation with the United States, not because we were seeking its friendship but because we were seeking normal relations. Italy mediated; and even King Khalid, when he visited us, said that he would attempt to have the aircraft held up by the United States released.

The United States told him not to (?try) as Libya is not going to have them. [passage indistinct] They visited us and we visited them. We entertained them and they entertained us [words indistinct] Germany, Romania, the Emirates, Belgium, a number of countries tried to mediate between us. Each time someone comes, a head of state or someone, and says: why is there animosity with the United States. We constantly declared that we were prepared to hold a dialogue with the United States, to sit face to face and have a dialogue. We should see what can possibly be done to establish relations between two states. Squabbling like children is not acceptable in international relations.

First, because the United States is a great power, and we say its relations with other states, particularly the small ones, must be neutral relations. It should respect and not work against Libya whose population is 2 or 3 million. The United States is preoccupied only with Libya. Its National Security Council meets only to (?discuss) Libya. All Reagan's statements are about Libya. Even the man in the street in the United States now comments and says the Reagan administration exists to administer the Libyan problem. And it has no other preoccupation. The U.S. President has before him only the Libyan file. There is no other, just like the Vietnamese problem. The only preoccupation of the U.S. administration nowadays is the Libyan problem. The truth is that many states tried to mediate to improve relations [words indistinct] prepared to enter into a dialogue with the United States; we are prepared to meet and to build relations of mutual respect, but all mediators failed. When we asked why, they once said that Libya occupied Chad. We said then that the Libyan forces would remain in Chad until they were asked to leave. When they were asked to leave, they did. They were asked to leave by Goukouni who had requested their presence. When Goukouni asked them to leave, they left (?immediately). They said: Your relations with your neighbors are not good and your neighbors are our associates; As-Sadat died and the tension between ourselves and Egypt lessened and the military forces withdrew and we left the fate of Egypt to the Egyptian people, to the Egyptian opposition. This doesn't mean that we approve of what is taking place in Egypt. Egypt is on the blacklist because it has recognized the enemy. The worst crime as far as the Arab nation is concerned is recognizing the Israeli enemy as a state on Palestinian land. Therefore, we are openly in alliance with the Egyptian opposition so that it will take over authority and do away with all the agreements which Egypt has signed with the enemy, and to return Egypt to the Arabs -- not the Arabs to Egypt -- Egypt returns to the Arabs. The Arabs, the Arabs of Palestine. They are struggling for the liberation of Palestine, not the capitulation of Arabs. Arabism disowns this.

Our relations with Tunisia, thank God, are good. On the day that a statement was issued that relations between Libya and Tunisia have entered a new phase; we have established new cooperation built on economic integration between the two countires. When they heard that statement, they issued an order withdrawing their companies and placing a ban on purchases of Libyan oil; they have even banned the export of electronic equipment to Libya. President Bourguiba and I met and I said to him: Look what the Americans have done. They have retaliated against us because we have established new cooperation between the two countries. This was the opposite of what the Americans used to believe. They claimed that relations between Libya and Egypt were no good; they said relations between Libya and Tunisia were no good, that relations between Libya and any other Arab country were no good. The fact is relations between Arab countries are good except the relations with the agents. The Americans are full of excuses. We always tell them they have too many excuses. Now, the Libyan forces, at the request of the government of Goukouni, have withdrawn.

This issue was settled by the parties concerned. The United States has nothing to do with the presence of the Libyan forces in Chad nor with their departure from Chad [words indistinct] Goukouni asked for the withdrawal of our forces and not the United States; if the United States had asked we would not have left and we would have challenged the United States. The United States claimed we would not leave Chad. We challenged it. We did not leave. The United States was shouting. All were shouting. Numayri was shouting. The Libyan forces were at his border. He was forced to admit that the Goukouni government was the legitimate government [words indistinct]. But when Goukouni said: Please take your forces out, we pulled out our forces. This is because we are not colonialists. All were taken aback,; they (?wanted) to do harm to our reputation and (?say) we were enemies of Africa and invaders and colonizers. They wanted to use it as a pretext to tarnish our reputation by claiming that we are invaders and enemies of Africa, enemies of the people of Chad and colonialists.

After we withdrew from Chad, it happened that we were the true freedom fighters. We showed we had honor and principles. We were not after booty or colonization or expansion.

All the arguments the United States put forward have collapsed. Yet the United States continues to take a hostile stand toward the Arabs and toward the Libyans.

But the real problem is that of Palestine. The United States is determined to impose the so-called Israel on the Arabs, to impose recognition of so-called Israel -- not only recognition of Israel within its borders with the Arabs also having their own borders. Not at all, it wants recognition of its existence in the heart of the Arab homeland so that it may undermine Arab existence and expand. First, Israel decreed that no Arab should enter the nuclear age. It said: We will destroy any Arab country that builds an nuclear reactor. Israel said this openly. It destroyed the Iraqi reactor. This means that it has decreed that the Arab nation will never enter the age of progress.

The United States approves this Israeli line. When the United Nations condemned Israel, the United States protested and used its veto. We wonder who was in the right. No Arab should build a nuclear reactor and enter the nuclear age while Israel has its own nuclear reactor which is producing atomic bombs. America enabled Israel to produce nuclear bombs.

Israel has not signed the nonproliferation treaty on nuclear weapons. Thus, under international law, the Israeli nuclear reactor is illegal. This is because the Israelis are not signatories to the treaty banning nuclear weapons. Iraq, on the other hand, is a signatory to the treaty. Furthermore, it had certified that its reactor was intended for peaceful purposes and would be put to peaceful use and not to military use. Iraq was thus one of the signatories to the nonproliferation treaty on nuclear weapons. Yet, Israel destroyed the Iraqi reactor.

Hence, the Arabs are not to be blamed if they destroy the Israeli nuclear reactor, as Israel destroyed the nuclear reactor of our Iraqi brothers. When the Iraqi nuclear reactor was hit, I said to them: Let us end all our problems on condition that we arrive at joint Arab action.

Morocco: We will no longer aid the Polisario; we will no longer stand by it militarily. They (?gave) it its independence and wanted to hold a referendum and we blessed the referendum proposal. We only beg you to (?unite) and restore Arab prestige in the eyes of the world. Only the Arabs must restore their prestige in the eyes of the world.

The Arab is (?humiliated) and defeated in Baghdad, in Palestine, in the Golan, in Saudi Arabia and everywhere else. Strange the non-Arabs say: You are a nation of [word indistinct] million, who are you defeated by 3 million? [sentence indistinct] We say to the Arabs: Make use of your power or commit suicide; that would be better. But restore your prestige; this is not fate. They speak about the unity of Arab ranks. What do I care about the unity of Arab ranks? The Arab ranks are (?standing there with a commander at their head.) The United States is ordering the Arabs to make an about-turn or turn left or right. America is the commander of the Arab ranks [words indistinct].

The Fahd plan for the Arabs to meet in Fes and discuss the recognition of Israel [word indistinct]. This is the positive answer, this is the unity of Arab action. We told them: Brothers, we Arabs have a cause and it is not proper for them to submit such plans. Let a third party submit them. When two quarrel, is it reasonable for one of them to propose a way of settling their quarrel? This should be proposed by the one who is mediating between them. We must liberate Palestine. Get out of it or we will fight you. The Jews say Palestine is the promised land [words indistinct]. Let a third party come, the United Nations, the Security Council, the superpowers, the small powers, the nonaligned or any other third party and present a middle solution. Then we Arabs state our opinion and the Jews theirs and let everyone make the most of this opportunity. But when we Arabs, the basic side, the owners of the cause, come and present a plan which recognizes Israel, what will they say afterward? The Israelis have never submitted a plan in which they suggest returning to the 1947 partition (?regarding) a Palestinian state or sharing the Palestinian territory half and half or one quarter and three quarters or withdrawing. They have never submitted such a thing. They say Jerusalem is the eternal unified capital of Israel, that they recognize neither Arabs nor Muslims in Jerusalem. They say: It is a Jewish capital; Israel is the promised land; greater Israel extends from the Euphrates to the Nile and Mecca [words indistinct] and Abraham was a Jew. They say: You Arabs have occupied it but it (?should be under) the Israeli flag because it was built by Abraham, but you may circumambulate the Ka'aba. They also said Madinah is their town and Muhammad expelled them from it. They say they must return and take revenge in Tabuk and now they are flying over it with their aircraft.

The Israelis have never submitted a plan such as that submitted by Fahd. They have never said: Let us solve the problem of Palestine. They have always said: This is our land and not yours, you Arabs. This is the promised land. Do not build any military force because we will destroy you. The United States agrees with what Israel is doing. Saudi Arabia is funding the United States. Could there be a worse profanity than this?

Has Islam an enemy worse than Saudi Arabia? Have the Arabs an enemy worse than Saudi Arabia? Who is selling out Jerusalem now? The Saudis themselves, the Saudis. They are defiling Mecca. Things have come to a head between them and me. We have reached the end of our tether. [passage indistinct] They have slaves and concubines. The people are poor. There is no dignity. There is no Islam. [passage indistinct] The situation is much worse than it used to be in the pre-Islamic era. But we said: Never mind. I sent a cable to the king of Saudi Arabia; I sent a cable to the king of Morocco; I sent a cable to Jordan; [words indistinct] one was forced to do such things. The purpose was to establish joint action [words indistinct].

They came out with a decision -- a plan calling on us to recognize Israel. [passage indistinct]. This is humiliation.

Jordan has solidarity with Iraq (?but not against) the Israelis; it has joined Iraq but not to strike at the Israelis but to strike at Islam in Iran. Why? Because the shah used to be in Iran, an agent of the United States, the closest friend of the Israelis, who used to give the Israelis oil and all other means; the ally of the Israelis in the Near East used to be the shah. Those Arabs are sorry to have seen the shah fall -- the ally of Israel and the United States. Now they are fighting those who caused the downfall of the shah. King Husayn is now standing at the border saluting the forces leaving to participate with Iraq in the war aginst Iran, when Jerusalem is just a stone's throw away from him. Is there a greater disgrace than this? Is there a greater farce than this? [words indistinct] and says they are volunteers.

He declares that the Jordanian Army is fighting on the side of Iraq, Saddam Husayn, against the Islamic revolution in Iran. Today Jordan has officially joined the war. Iran is now engaged with not only one Arab state but it is engaged militarily with Jordan and Iraq. Politically and economically, Iran is engaged with Saudi Arabia and the states which revolve in its orbit and which are compelled to [words indistinct].

Saudi Arabia in financing the war in Iran. Why? Because it lost when the shah of Iran was toppled. This means the Saudi (?regime) will be toppled by the revolutionaries. Instead of giving its oil to Palestinian resistance and instead of building a Palestinian liberation army or instead of giving it ot the poor in Yemen or in any place [words indistinct], Saudi Arabia is giving this oil to the Jews and to Egypt. The problem is the question of Palestine. They want Israel to be recognized and any military or economic power should be destroyed.

They said Libya has a military power and is stocking more arms than it needs. We are one million armed people and need more arms than we have since we are defending ourselves. They are threatening us with the U.S. 6th Fleet which carries nuclear bombs, missiles and aircraft. They ask us: Why do you obtain arms? It is our right to arm ourselves with all the tools of destruction so that we can confront the U.S. 6th Fleet. We are militarily confronting the U.S. 6th Fleet and the United States. The United States has nothing more powerful that the 6th Fleet, on which all its bases in Europe depend. It is our right to buy thousands of tanks and aircraft, guns, ships and machineguns to defend our homes.

We have not aggressed upon U.S. shores. We have not crossed the Atlantic to attack America. We have not flown in American skies or sailed in American territorial waters.

The United States occupies all the oceans. Yet it could not find a place to carry out its maneuvers except the Gulf of Sidra, the area extending between Benghazi and Mistrata, that trangular area. Is there more aggression than this aggression? Can there be a greater challenge than this challenge and a greater injustice than this injustice? This is what we are facing. If one dies, it is his destiny.

[Words indistinct] since America is facing us with its military might isn't it logical for us to (?buy) arms and transform them into bombs. Yet, the United States has clamored against us, saying why does Libya buy more arms than it needs. But what is Libya's need? The United States brought in its 6th Fleet. [words indistinct] in the face of the American 6th Fleet. Each aircraft carrier of the 6th Fleet carries scores of aircraft and nuclear bombs.

The United States realizes that Libya has its military force, its economic revival, both industrial and agricultural, and has freedom. Before, when the imperialists left, they used to leave behind an agent. All peoples were thus subdued. The agent used to collaborate with imperialism. He does what they tell him to do whether in his own country or other countries. Thus, imperialism used to be constantly present. But this is the first time for peoples to exist without a government, as is the case with the Libyan people today.

Are there any free officers occupying a post of authority? Is any one of them a minister, a senior official? We appointed so many people. But we never appointed free officers as ministers, ambassadors and [word indistinct]. They are prohibited from assuming such posts just as members of the revolutionary committees are prohibited from exercising authority. The situation is settled. The free unionist officers are prohibited from exercising authority.

Officers have died in Chad, [word indistinct], Uganda and other places. That was their duty. They are still prepared to die. They have decided to die. The Libyan people are still prepared to die. They have made the decision to die. Nobody can prevent us from making such a decision. [applause] We are free to make the decision to die. Let America know that we Libyans have made the death decision. It cannot prevent us from doing so. When one makes the death decision, nobody can defeat him. Anyone who seeks other than the decision to die can be influenced in whatever he is seeking. [Words indistinct] but he who makes the decision to die and carries his life in his hand, fears no one and no one can do anything to him. He no longer fears anything. He has broken the fear barrier.

We in our revolutionary movement have broken the death barrier. We have broken the fear barrier. We are no longer afraid of the United States or anyone else. We are determined to defeat America, even if it were to use its nuclear bombs, thereby starting a third world war. It will be faced by by one million Libyans; 500 Libyans for every kilometer. America's entire might cannot shake these men from these kilometers. One million Libyans will be deployed along the coast. America will either have to use its nuclear bombs -- and then hell will break loose in the whole world, on the whole earth -- or accept defeat in spite of itself, just as in Vietnam, through conventional weapons.

[Words indistinct] thousands of soldiers from Libya [words indistinct] we must make this decision and we must protect it so that we may strike America in deeds and not in words. We are defending the Arab nation. We defend the Arab nation and its honor and we fight to destroy the arrogance of this fierce enemy who despises the Arabs, encroaches upon them and exploits their wealth, spits on them and gives their lands to the Jews. The resolution we took remains the same: that Libya supports the Palestinian resistance. We developed the weapons for the Palestinian resistance [word indistinct] Israel to destroy Libyan military power, the factories and farms of Libya to subdue the Libyan people. The American companies were a mark of shame for Libya. To cooperate with American companies was shameful. Thank God we got rid of them. You Libyans should think first how to keep your oil [word indistinct]. Oil still exists. Saudi Arabia is the one which [words indistinct] but our oil is under our feet. We did not allow them to occupy our oilfields. Think how to turn to production. We have urged this so often. We have called: Production, production, production. But you have not listened. [Words indistinct]

The important thing is for man to secure his food and continue with his revolution. What is the use of living in a marble palace when you are hungry? What will you do? Will you eat the marble?

JANA: SAUDI ARABIA LEADS OIL PRICE REDUCTION

LD041932 Tripoli JANA in English 1838 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Kuwait, 4 Mar (JANA) -- Saudi press reports have stressed that Fahd Ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz had made it clear that he would personally lead an international quest to reduce oil prices in the world down to 25 dollars per barrel.

In a recent meeting with proprietors and editors of Saudi papers and magazines, he alleged that anybody who endeavours to reduce oil prices is working to destroy 20th century civilization.

Meanwhile, informed sources said Fahd issued a warning to journalists demanding from them to keep fully in line with the ruling family's policy whether regarding oil matters or politics or even art and literature. These sources added that Fahd was extremely tense during the meeting.

SUDAN

INTERNAL AFFAIRS MINISTER ON POLITICAL ISSUES

GF030615 Kuwait AS-SIYASAH in Arabic 1 Mar 82 p 20

[Interview granted to the AS-SIYASAH correspondent in Khartoum, Babakr Hasan Makki, by Dr Muhammad 'Uthman, minister of internal affairs -- date not given]

[Excerpts] [Question] What is the nature of the recent developments in Sudan?

[Answer] Which recent developments?

[Question] The developments which began with student demonstrations followed by dissolving the supreme bodies of the Socialist Union and finally dismissal of President Numayri's vice president and 22 senior officers?

[Answer] If we want to explain the political developments in Sudan, we must view the proposed developmental pattern. This pattern started with broad ambitions, particularly in the program of the six-stage plan. This pattern resulted in many problems that were the cause of the recent student demonstrations. The demonstrations were also the result of the increased sugar prices. However, we noticed that these demonstrations, which were spontaneous, were exploited by opposition elements. At this point, we must stress that all or most of these political developments were not within the framework of the political problems. In the Sudanese socialist and revolutionary regime, we make continuous revisions and changes in accordance with the nature of the revolutionary work. Thus, the activity of the Socialist Union continued to be discussed and measures continued to be adopted at various stages. What happened recently stemmed from our democratic dialogue about the various departments. The correct analysis is that we might have reached advanced stages in economic development and that this made both the virtues and problems of our policy more obvious. We also reached an advanced stage in political development to establish local popular rule and decentralized rule to the extent that this political era has been integrated within the framework of its concept, departments and democratic performance. With the integration of these political and economic programs, we have entered a new stage. There is now a call -- which was supposed to be discussed by the extraordinary conference -- to discuss and evaluate these experiences. We also stated it is necessary for the Socialist Union to enter the stage where it can acquire a completely new character.

Thus, all these stages are part of genuine revolutionary change and renewal. Regrettably, these measures are being interpreted, particularly by the Arab press and possibly by some regimes hostile to Sudan, to mean unrest and problems. Perhaps it is right to say that what is taking place in Sudan through popular will and democratic practices represents a political example that is different from most of the Arab political examples. This may worry some Arab states, particularly those who claim to be progressive and democratic. This level is characterized by a moral feature that stems from the nature of the Sudanese people and their concern about sovereignty, independence and human honor and freedom.

[Question] During the recent Cabinet reshuffle, the Ministry of Information was dissolved and merged with the Ministry of Internal Affairs. What is your explanation for this step?

[Answer] There is a fundamental point. That is the president's fulfillment of his promise to apply decentralization in the government because this is a constitutional commitment. This decentralization necessitates shifting authority from the central government to the masses on the regional or local level. The president's fulfillment of this commitment made him side with decentralization. However, as the fulfillment of decentralization is made and as the establishment of regional governments is being implemented and supported, there is also the preservation of coordination in the central government and the reestablishment of the central government in a new form, because it tends to be influenced by decentralization.

We have not disregarded press nationalism or its role in stability and social integration. However, you may have noticed that unlike some other Arab states we are not concerned with propaganda, but with democracy. We do not justify our decisions or the authority or our leadership as much as we grant authority to the masses.

Within this framework, we have given the radio and television their freedom and democracy by making them independent bodies. We also implemented this with the news agency, which is also an independent body not belonging to a ministry and not affected by the bureaucracy.

The remaining bodies, such as the information and other departments, which form a complementary and integrated part, have been merged with the Ministry of Internal Affairs because of their similarity. This ministry will continue to contain the remaining central departments that underwent changes until their position is reconsidered. Thus, the name "Ministry of Internal Affairs" does not reflect any security measures nor does it include the police as does the concept of the "Interior Ministry."

WESTERN SAHARA

ABDELAZIZ DRAWS CONCLUSIONS FROM OAU MEETING

LD021352 Algiers APS in English 1032 GMT 2 Mar 82

[Text] SADR (Liberated Territories), 2 Mar (APS) -- In an exclusive interview devoted to the ALGERIAN NEWS AGENCY APS and to the national daily EL-MOUDJAHID Mr Mohamed Abdelaziz, Polisario Front secretary general, president of SADR command council, drew the results of the situation on the diplomatic and military plans at the morrow of the accession of the Saharan Arab Democratic Republic (SADR) to the Organization of African Unity.

The Polisario Front secretary general also evoked the role henceforth reserved to the OAU implementing committee, the dangers and the consequences of the American intervention in the conflict, the role of France for a peaceful solution in Western Sahara and notably the opening of direct negotiations between SADR and Morocco.

The high Saharan responsible also drew the forthcoming prospects of the Saharan people struggle, after the great victory led in Addis Ababa.

Before paying tribute to the states members which defended the charter and the General Secretariat for its firmness before the last Moroccan pressures and manoeuvres, Mr Mohamed Abdelaziz declared that "the OAU and Africa avoid the adventure where Hassan II wanted to lure them. Our solid organization proved to be inflexible in the application and respect of its charter," he added.

To a question relating to the role henceforth imparted to the OAU implementing committee, the Polisario Front secretary general declared that "the mission of the committee was defined by the resolution in that very sense at 18th Nairobi summit which means to find a solution to the Western Sahara conflict, on the basis of the recovering of the Saharan people's legitimate and inalienable rights. "To reach this objective, he added, there is no other possibility than the direct negotiation between Morocco and SADR for a definitive peace accord.

Asked about the future prospects of the Saharan people's struggle and of the action that SADR wants to lead within international movements and organizations, after its admission within a continental organization: i.e., OAU Mr Mohamed Abdelaziz indicated that his country wants to consolidate its position within international community. "We are going to act, he pointed out, so as to definitely clarify before the international community the real nature of both parties in conflict in Western Sahara.

"On the African plan Mr Abdelaziz declared, our action will constantly be animated by the concern to work for the preservation of the OAU Charter and principles for the achievement of the liberation of the continent and its unity as to the principle of intangibility of borders inherited at the independence. [quotation marks as received]

ETHIOPIA

MENGISTU REPORTEDLY INJURED IN ERITREA

NC050928 Paris AFP in English 0913 GMT 5 Mar 82

[Text] Rome, 5 Mar (AFP) -- Ethiopian head of state Mengistu Haile Mariam has been injured on the battlefront against secessionist guerrillas in Eritrea, a spokesman for the Eritrean Peoples' Liberation Front (EPLF) said here today.

Spokesman Mohamad Iman Ahmed said that Colonel Mengistu was wounded near Afabet, close to the secessionist-held town of Nafka in northern Eritrea, when he visited the war zone by helicopter.

According to a well-informed Eritrean source here, two Soviet generals with Colonel Mengistu were also wounded, but Mr Ahmed was unable to confirm this. He said only that two "European officers" were apparently with the Ethiopian leader at the time of the incident.

(An EPLF spokesman in Paris said that the wounded head of state might be flown to Moscow for treatment.)

There has been violent fighting in northern Eritrea since February 12, after the Ethiopian Government launched its operation red star in a new bid to crush the 20-year-old Eritrean secessionist movement. Afabet lies to the south of Nafka, which is the last town in Eritrean hands.

SOMALIA

DPRK DELEGATION ENDS 5-DAY VISIT 25 FEB

EA251910 Mogadishu Domestic Service in Somali 1400 GMT 25 Feb 82

[Summary] DPRK Vice Premier Chong Chun-ki and his delegation left Mogadishu today for home at the end of a 5-day visit to Somalia.

UGANDA

OUTGOING PRC AMBASSADOR DISCUSSES AID, TIES

EA042322 Kampala Domestic Service in English 1000 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Excerpt] The PRC has extended a loan of 120,000 pounds to the Uganda Government for the purchase of spares for the (Kirimba) Rice Company. This was revealed by the outgoing Ambassador of the PRC His Excellency Zhang Bochuan, when he called on the Minister of State for Agriculture Dr Patrick Rubaihayo, at his office in Entebbe.

At a luncheon given in his honor in Lake Victoria Hotel, Entebbe, the ambassador complimented the good relationship that exists between Uganda and the Chinese. The ambassador assured the minister that China is committed to assisting Uganda especially in development of agriculture. The ambassador praised the Ugandan counterparts, who, through their good cooperation with the Chinese experts at (Kirimba) and (Doho), enabled the scheme to succeed. He further said that some Chinese experts would remain in (Kirimba) Rice Company to assist their counterparts in running it.

Dr Rubaihayo in turn thanked the people of China for their timely assistance to Uganda. The minister praised the ambassador for the good relationship between Uganda and China. He emphasized that a wide scope for cooperation between the two countries exists.

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

KOLINGBA DISMISSES FOUR IN CABINET RESHUFFLE

AB041709 Paris AFP in French 1647 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Excerpt] Bangui, 4 Mar (AFP) -- A day after the attempted coup d'etat in Bangui, the CAR head of state, Gen Andre Kolingba, today made a reshuffle in the ruling Military Committee for National Redress [CMRN].

Generals Alphonse Mbaikoua and Francois Bozize leave the CMRN. Reliable sources also indicate that these two generals were chief instigators of last night's abortive coup d'etat and they are now on the run. Quartermaster Thimotee Marloua (finance and economy) and Lt Col Martin Dokossi (trade and industry) also leave the government.

New Government List

AB041741 Paris AFP in French 1712 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Bangui, 4 Mar (AFP) -- The new composition of the Military Committee for National Redress [CMRN]:

CMRN chairman, head of state and government, minister of national defense and veterans affairs, chief of general army staff	Gen Andre Kolingba
Minister of energy, mines and geology	Brig Abel Nado
Minister of transport and civil aviation	Brig Mabangui Paul
Minister of justice, labor and social security	Brig Xavier-Sylvestre Yangongo
Minister of civil service	Col Gaston Ouedane
Minister of foreign affairs, planning and international cooperation	Lt Col Jean-Louis Gervil-Yambala
Minister of interior	Lt Col Sebastien Guipi
Minister of agriculture and stockbreeding	Lt Col Alphonse Gombadi
Minister of national education	Lt Col Antoine Gambi
Minister of public works and urbanism	Lt Col Thomas Mapouka
Minister of government general secretariat and information	Lt Col Christopher Grelombe
Minister of posts and telecommunications	Maj Michel-Paulin Xondeboli
Minister of public health and social affairs	Maj Dr Gabriel Ngaindiro
Minister of economy and finance	Quartermaster Alphonse Kongolo
Minister of water, forests, hunting, fishing and tourism	Maj Evariste Konzale
Minister of youth, sports, arts and culture	Capt Gaston Gambor
Secretary of state for trade, commerce planning and statistics	Maj Jerome Alame
Secretary of state for foreign affairs	Capt Paul Dimassi
Secretary of state for finance	Capt Denis Wangao
Secretary of state for information	Capt Guillaume Lappo
Secretary of state for interior	Capt Alphonse Konzi

AFP REPORTS NORMAL SITUATION IN BANGUI 4 MAR

AB041845 Paris AFP in French 1802 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Excerpts] Bangui, 4 Mar (AFP) -- The CAR head of state, Gen Andre Kolingba, on Thursday reshuffled the Military Committee for National Redress [CMRN], a day after the abortive coup attempt which resulted in acts of looting and setting up of roadblocks in Bangui. The situation returned to normal in the CAR capital on Thursday.

In Bangui there was the usual bustle in the streets on Thursday morning. No patrols could be seen and there were only a few soldiers mounting guard in front of government buildings. The people went to work as usual while offices and stores were generally open as usual.

Also, the situation is orderly in the popular quarters, Miskine, Gobongo, Galabadja, where there was some excitement last night.

At dawn, soldiers removed the emergency roadblocks set up here and there. Lootings were reported in one of those quarters where stores belonging to Lebanese nationals were ransacked.

On the other hand, it was learned that tracts announcing the coup d'etat had been distributed on Wednesday by a group of demonstrators riding in a car. Around 2100 local time, old tires were burned and stones thrown onto the roadway in some popular quarters.

At 2340, Minister of Information and Culture Gen Francois Bozize read a brief statement on Radio Bangui, announcing the imminent coup to be staged by Lieutenant Colonel Diallo, commander of the CAR gendarmerie. Just 10 minutes later, Lieutenant Colonel Diallo denied the report.

At 0008, CAR head of state Andre Kolingba appealed for calm on radio Bangui and called on his fellow citizens to be vigilant. In a hard tone, he announced that he would maintain law and order in the country at "any price." General Kolingba urged all soldiers to return to their barracks and stated that the abortive coup d'etat concerned only soldiers.

The CMRN has been meeting since Thursday morning in an extraordinary council session without break under the chairmanship of the head of state.

By Thursday evening, the extent of Gen Francois Bozize's involvement was still not known, especially in view of his radio statement. [Words indistinct] the army which is supposed to be loyal to Gen Andre Kolingba.

The abortive coup d'etat, which took place on the night of Wednesday to Thursday, comes 3 days after the return to Bangui of Ange Patasse, leader of the Central African Peoples' Liberation Movement, who has been away for several months.

MALAWI

PRESIDENTS BANDA, KAUNDA HOLD TALKS

CA261104 Lusaka Domestic Service in English 0600 GMT 26 Feb

[Text] President Kaunda has said Zambia and Malawi pursued similar principles of putting man first. He said Zambians are nonracial and do not believe the color of a man has anything to do with the way he behaves, adding that this is the attitude which should be established in the Third World. Dr Kaunda, who was speaking during the first round of talks with Malawi President Dr Kamazu Banda in Blantyre, welcomed Malawi's entry into the Southern African Development Coordination Conference and the Preferential Trade Area, saying that that showed that Malawi wanted to be part and parcel of the region's economic [word indistinct]. He said the Zambian delegation was looking forward to exchanging views with their counterparts.

Earlier, the Malawi president, Dr Kamuzu Banda, said in Blantyre that minority races are allowed to stay in Malawi only on the understanding that the majority of the people are in control. Dr Banda declared that the days of white first, Asians second, coloreds third and blacks last are over because the indigenous majority in Malawi are now firmly in power. Dr Banda declared: We are the rulers and we are in the majority. There are still many white people and Asians in Malawi, but we allow them to stay as long they know that we are in control. He said while Malawi seeks justice for all races, whites must not say that they are superior, adding that Malawian people must be respected by other races.

MOZAMBIQUE

FRONTLINE STATES TO HOLD SUMMIT 6-7 MAR

EA041848 Maputo Domestic Service in Portugese 1700 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Ministry of Foreign Affairs communique, issued 4 March]

[Text] Talks will be held in Maputo 6-7 March among heads of state and goverments of the frontline countries: Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique, Botswana, Angola and Zimbabwe. The meeting is for normal consultations between the frontline countries at the head of state and government level. The situation in southern Africa also will be discussed.

Mugabe To Attend

CA041622 Salisbury Domestic Service in English 1115 GMT 3 Mar 82

[Excerpts] Frontline heads of state and government will converge on the Mozambican capital, Maputo, on Saturday for a 2-day summit meeting. The leaders are expected to discuss the Namibian independence question. A spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs confirmed in Salisbury this morning that the prime minister, Comrade Mugabe, will attend the meeting.

SOUTH AFRICA

MINISTER ON SANCTIONS, SOVIET PENETRATION

LD282302 Johannesburg International Servicein English 2100 GMT 28 Feb 82

[Text] The South African minister of foreign affairs, Mr Roelof Botha, says he is convinced that if SWAPO should win an election in South-West Africa/Namibia, Russia would be sitting pretty in Windhoek.

Interviewed by Radio Republic of South Africa Mr Botha said that if this were to happen Walvis Bay would be threatened and South Africa would be confronted with the possibility of military action to protect her interests. On the other hand, if South Africa did not go ahead with settlement negotiations it would be faced with the prospect of economic sanctions which could also have serious implications for the country. Mr Botha said that if South Africa had to choose between these alternatives, it would choose sanctions, which it would be able to survive. South Africa would not be able to survive Russian penetration, however, without a massive effort.

Mr Botha said events in Zimbabwe carried an ominous message for the people of South-West Africa/Nambia, but they would have only themselves to blame if a Zimbabwe-type of situation came about in the territory after indpendence. Guarantees such as those supplied for Zimbabwe by the British foreign secretary, Lord Carrington, were worthless. The situation in Zambabwe was deteriorating and the country was going the way of many other African states.

Mr Botha said South Africa could not win the political struggle in South-West Africa/Nambia. That was something South-West Africans/Namibians would have to do for themselves. It was a big mistake to believe South Africa had pledged a democratic government for the independent South-West Africa/Namibia. South Africa had only stated that in negotiations it would do its best to gain optimum terms for a settlement without, if possible, having sanctions imposed against South Africa. He gave a warning that if a country became so concerned with small ideological points that it failed to come to grips with [words indistinct] orchestrated attacks of the Soviet Union, such a country would go the way of Zimbabwe.

ZIMBABWE

JOSHUA NKOMO COMMENTS ON PRESENT SITUATION

DW040847 Bonn DIE WELT in German 3 Mar 82 p 6

[Interview with Joshua Nkomo in Salisbury; date not given]

[Text] WELT: Why aren't you in prison yet?

NKOMO: Because I haven't done anything. Mugabe is lying and he knows it. He is posing as policeman, civil servant, judge and jailer. Since he can place me on trial, why hasn't he done it? Because he has about reached his end as a politician and because he wants to distract people's attention from his own failure. He wants to intimidate the people -- Nkomo is to be blamed for everything. He has nightmares over the fact that he could be overthrown because the country is breaking down, primarily because of his economic policy.

WELT: What should be done?

NKOMO: It's no longer my business to tell Mugabe what to do. He never listened to my proposals because they came from another party and he feared he could be more successful in elections. He invented the gravest accusations to smash ZAPU and to make sure that there would be no opposition in the coming elections. He is afraid. He takes tough measures and he intimidates the people.

WELT: So it is a dictatorship?

NKOMO: I didn't use the term, but there is certainly hardness toward the people. He is aware that he didn't win the 1980 elections because of his program but rather through terror. He is aware of this.

WELT: Can we speak of election fraud in 1980?

NKOMO: I know that people were killed during these elections, but I don't want to talk about that now.

WELT: Do you believe that the next elections will be free?

Nkomo: With a man like Mugabe there will be no free elections. He wants to destroy everyone except himself -- even his colleagues.

WELT: Will the people resort to other means?

Nkomo: That's the business of the Zimbabwean people. I myself fought against imperialism; now the Zimbabweans themselves must solve their quarrels reasonably. Who wants to see people die? I will act politically but without force.

WELT: And if you are imprisoned?

Nkomo: I don't know what will happen then. The mood is already extremely tense. We are trying to calm the people down. How many years did Smith (the former white prime minister) keep me in prison? Eleven years, because I fought honestly for a just cause. Does Mugabe want to repeat the history Smith made?

WELT: What do you have to say about the North Koreans in Zimbabwe?

Nkomo: I don't want to talk about that.

WELT: What do you think of a unity party?

Nkomo: That's something the Europeans find hard to understand. In Africa Europe's political system, which is based on lies, just doesn't work. On the other hand, in Africa the opposition which is outside the tribe is considered to be enemy of the whole group. We Africans consist of tribes -- Mashona, Matabele and Zulu. This mentality still exists and those who are in opposition outside the tribe are considered traitors. Moreover, we have just gotten over a civil war and we will need a lot of time to create order here. We will also need a lot of time to develop a national way of thinking. This must be considered when we talk about a one-party state. This can only emerge from the people's will and all groups making up the nation must take part. It will take a long time. What must above all be abolished is the present government's practice of giving out posts on the basis of tribal and political criteria.

WELT: Do you believe that the economic failure is a result of the government's socialist policy?

Nkomo: What socialism? There is no socialism here, only failure.

WELT: Mugabe has announced that he wants to appoint new white ministers.

Nkomo: Yes, he wants to calm the whites. He is trying to use words to abolish the fear that his actions have created. He should act rather than talk.

WELT: What do the people think about the discoveries of weapons for which you have been blamed?

Nkomo: On the day following his press conference, Mugabe tried through his party to organize a mass rally in Salisbury. It was a total debacle, and Mugabe was ashamed and didn't even give his planned speech. Mugabe has most gravely accused me, but the people cannot be deceived. He is trying to incite them, he wants a new civil war.

OFFICIAL ACCUSES UNITED STATES IN OAU WALKOUT

AB041635 Paris AFP in English 1619 GMT 4 Mar 82

[Text] Salisbury, 4 March (AFP) -- Zimbabwe today accused the United States of having encouraged the walkout by 19 countries from last month's Organization of African Unity (OAU) meeting in Addis Ababa to try to prevent the holding of the OAU's next summit in Libya.

The head of the Zimbabwean delegation to the ministerial council meeting, Simbarashe Mumbengegwi, told a news conference that there had been a "very active lobby by some Western powers" to persuade some delegations to leave the meeting over the question of the Western Sahara.

The 19, led by Morocco, walked out in protest at the admission at the meeting as the OAU's 51st member of the Saharan Democratic Arab Republic (SDAR) declared in the Moroccan-claimed territory by the Polisario Liberation Front.

Mr Mumbengegwi said some Western powers -- among which the United States was "extremely active" -- had played on the doubts of some OAU members about the legitimacy of the admission to try to deprive the meeting of a quorum and keep it from concluding its business.

The agenda included setting the dates of the summit meeting in Tripoli, scheduled for July 26 to August 8.

Asked if he believed Britain or France -- 13 of the states which walked out are French-speaking former colonies -- had played a part along with the United States, Mr Mumbengegwi said their role was "not as active" as that of the United States.

Questioned after the news conference on who precisely led the U.S. lobby effort in Addis Ababa, Foreign Ministry officials said "their charge d'affaires".

Mr Mumbengegwi, who until last month's government reshuffle was deputy foreign minister and now heads water resources, said that the adhesion of a new member to the OAU is a "straight-forward administrative matter."

He said OAU Secretary General Edem Kodjo had acted correctly in ordering the republic's admission.

The minister declined however to blame the states that walked out, saying some of them "in good faith" felt the matter should have been referred to the heads of state at the next summit.

Zimbabwe is one of the majority of 26 OAU members that recognize the SDAR.

Regarding the claims by King Hassan of Morocco and others that the OAU could come apart over the Western Sahara issue, Mr Mumbengegwi said a "lot of work will have to be done before the summit to prevent a widening of the rift".

But he added that the outside powers involved in the council of ministers affairs "must regard the outcome as a disastrous failure" in that the meeting managed to do its business in spite of their efforts.

He said he expected more attempts to disrupt the Tripoli summit, saying that "naturally once someone has failed at stage one it is unrealistic to expect he will give up his efforts at stage two".

The Reagan administration has been waging a campaign against the regime of Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, who would, as summit host, automatically become the next chairman of the OAU, according to OAU custom.